

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE cleavage within the Christian Church between the Fundamentalists and those whom, for want of a better word, we may call the liberals, must be a matter of profound regret to those members—and they doubtless represent an overwhelming majority—of both parties who recognize the indefeasible importance both of the Church and of the Bible to the spiritual life. Any effort to bridge this gulf without the compromise of intellectual sincerity is eminently worth while. Incidentally an attempt to render this service has been made by the Rev. Professor H. L. GOUDGE, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, in his brief but thoroughly suggestive book on *The Church and the Bible* (Longmans ; 4s., paper covers 2s. 6d.).

Dr. GOUDGE is well qualified to make this attempt. For while he was brought up, as he tells us, to read the Bible in the Fundamentalist way, he is nevertheless convinced that the critics are 'substantially right.' Here, then, is a man who has the necessary inner sympathy with both sides, and only such a man can help us. What has he to say?

First, let us see how far he sympathizes with the critics ; for 'we shall shut our eyes,' he says, 'to nothing that the critic has to tell us.' One of those things which the critic has to tell us, and which Dr. GOUDGE admits, is that the representations of the past by Hebrew historians 'were often profoundly affected by the lessons which they wished to teach.' 'They have no scruples about mingling

fiction with history, when they are using both for the same purpose. There is history in the books of Chronicles, but there is fiction also.' Again, in discussing the character of the law of Sinai, he admits that 'the narrative of Exodus is here in confusion,' and that while in Joshua the conquest of Canaan is described as rapidly effected by the Divine power, 'we have only to turn to the book of Judges to see how different was the reality.' And again, 'we have no history that we can trust for details ; the historical framework (in Judges) is artificial, and some of the Judges may have been contemporaries.' No critic could ask for more. The man who could write those sentences has the right to be heard.

But here are some of his other sentences. 'If we ask what the Song of Songs means as a part of Scripture, the answer is that it sets forth the mutual love of Jehovah Incarnate and His Church,' and that, 'interpreted with restraint and reverence, it will supply us with beautiful thoughts' about the relation between Christ and His Church. Of Ecclesiastes he says that 'the book in its original form may have been nearer to the mind of Omar Khayyám than to that of Christ ; but as interpreters of Scripture we are not concerned with that. Words which in themselves would bear a heterodox meaning must be interpreted in accordance with the context which the later editors have provided for them.'

Again, 'the mystical interpreters have seen in

Isaac bearing "the wood of the burnt-offering" the Lord bearing His Cross; and, if we accept the highest meaning of the story as the truest meaning, it is right to see Him there.' Again, taught by St. Paul, we shall 'find in the Red Sea Holy Baptism, and in the manna our Eucharistic food.' This type of interpretation reaches its climax when we are invited to contemplate Jonah 'giving his life for the mariners'—the mariners whose peril, as the story implies, was directly due to Jonah's own disobedience—'and passing through seeming death and resurrection to be the evangelist of the heathen world'; and what an evangelist! 'angry and displeased exceedingly' (Jon 4¹) because the gracious God had cancelled His threat against the Ninevites upon their showing the fruits of repentance.

Here seems to speak the Fundamentalist; and the average critic will follow him, if at all, but far off and reluctantly. But to describe Dr. GOUDGE as a Fundamentalist would be to do him very much less than justice. What he is pleading for is the legitimacy not so much of the fundamentalist as of the mystical interpretation. With mystical interpretation, he assures us, historical criticism can have no quarrel. The meaning of Scripture grew with the advancing spiritual experience of the Church, and the original meaning, which it is the task of criticism to discover, by no means exhausts its meaning. Indeed, Dr. GOUDGE affirms that 'the original meaning of the words is often not their meaning as part of Canonical Scripture.'

Much of the original meaning of the ritual and ceremonial described in Leviticus is now beyond the possibility of recovery; but with that, it seems, we are not concerned. 'The true meaning is the highest meaning.' 'It is Calvary which must explain Leviticus, and not Leviticus Calvary.' It may even be that 'the unlearned Christian sometimes grasps the acquired meaning better than the scholar, since he is primarily interested in what the words mean and not in what they meant.'

This is an idea and a phrase to which Dr. GOUDGE recurs again and again: 'What Ecclesiastes meant,' he tells us, 'is one thing, and what it means is

another.' In many passages where our forefathers found the Lord and the modern critic fails to find Him, 'we must ask not only what the words originally meant, but what they came to mean and should mean to us.' 'We should put upon the old words the highest meaning we can give to them.' An interpretation of the Old Testament which is not in the modern sense historical 'is none the less not only true interpretation, but for us far more valuable than the historical interpretation itself.' The Church, with its growing experience, comes to interpret old words differently from the way in which they were at first interpreted. What they once meant is one thing, but what they now mean another.

We have quoted Dr. GOUDGE at some length, because we wished to have his defence of the mystical interpretation presented with unimpeachable fairness. Is that defence convincing? There is, we must admit, a certain measure of truth in it. The great words of the Bible, as of all noble literature, grow with the deepening experience of the race, and it may readily be conceded that the writers of the Old Testament spoke better than they knew.

The critic, too, will readily admit that interpolations may have not only historical interest, but high spiritual value. The brilliant hopes that seem to be occasionally appended to the stern threats of prophecy have their own value as a revelation of the mind of God just as truly as the threats whose force they are intended to mitigate.

But one may admit all this without going all the way with Dr. GOUDGE. 'The Church,' he says, 'has always believed in mystical interpretation, and that with justice,' and at one point he even laments the neglect into which the 'typology' of Scripture has fallen. The point at which we part company with Dr. GOUDGE is this. We believe that the later meaning may be *deeper* than the original meaning; he maintains, or appears to maintain, that it may be *different*. Though essentially we may perhaps not be very far apart, there appears to be here a real and important distinction. 'The Church,' we are told, 'comes to interpret old

words *differently*.' 'Hosea and others knew how to deal with the old tales, and what they mean is very *different* from what they meant' (italics ours).

Our contention is that to understand what a passage *means*, we must understand what it *meant*. If it is held to mean not only something deeper, but something different, who or what is to guarantee this later interpretation which is imported into or superimposed upon the original words? Perhaps Dr. GOUDGE would find this guarantee in the Spirit-led Church. But interpretation is necessarily conditioned by the intellectual atmosphere and methods of the time, and it is through these that the Spirit must work. If the methods and conclusions of one age carry no conviction to the mind of another, what then? If with the best will in the world we are unable to find in the sensuous imagery of the Song of Songs the love of Jehovah for His people or of Christ for His Church, what then? These things have their important place in the history of interpretation, but they cannot be determinative of the true meaning.

Whether one agrees or disagrees, however, with this contention, all will agree that Dr. GOUDGE has written a stimulating book; he has raised an important question and discussed it in a judicial and irenic spirit. He has also rendered a valuable service by reminding Catholics of the importance of the Bible, and Protestants of the importance of the Church; and his discussions are conducted with a calmness, trenchancy, fairness, and lucidity which forcibly remind us of Butler and his famous 'Analogy.'

The supplementary chapter of sixty-six pages prefixed to the recent reprint of the third edition (1923) of Dr. Charles HARRIS's textbook of apologetics, *Pro Fide*, does not attempt so much to solve problems as to point out where the problems lie. None the less it is a useful chapter, as at once indicating the most recent phases of apologetical discussion and introducing the reader to much of the relevant literature.

Dr. HARRIS begins by suggesting that the Christian apologist need not pay so much attention to *Modernism* as was desirable half a dozen years ago. In recent theology it is not the modernist but the liberal-orthodox (or critical-catholic) who has been most prominent; and the bulk of liberal thought appears to favour the liberal-orthodox rather than the definitely modernist position. The outstanding characteristic of the liberal-orthodox school, it is added, is its attempt to revive the speculative spirit of Origen, greatest of the early apologists. The veteran editor of 'Lux Mundi' may be regarded as the head of this school, and a notable exponent of it is Fr. Thornton in his recent study of the Incarnation. All this may be granted, but although the output of modernist literature may have diminished, the spirit of Modernism is still alive.

Indeed, Dr. HARRIS allows that there is a modified form of Monism still in much vogue to-day which is allied to Modernism on the philosophical side. He would name it *Semi-Pantheism*. What is the difference between Semi-Pantheism and Pantheism? Semi-Pantheism aims at modifying Pantheism in such a way as to render it consistent with, in particular, the Christian doctrine of creation. It is implied in a saying like this, 'Creation is the complement of God,' or this, 'The relation of God to the world is organic.' On such a theory, it is here declared, we are logically compelled to postulate the existence of some unknown 'Super-God' (something like the 'Veiled Being' of Mr. Wells) to account for the existence of God and the world.

Dr. HARRIS also touches upon the relations between Science and Religion, in which he notes a change for the better in recent years. The pressure of the strain between the two has been largely relieved not only by the almost universal acceptance by orthodox theologians of the Darwinian doctrine of evolution, but also by the new emphasis on the part of evolutionists upon *emergence*, by which is meant the unexplained appearance—generally in ascending series—of new qualities and values. At the present time the view that evolution is an 'emergent' process, or—in Bergson's phrase—a 'creative' process, is widely accepted

not only by philosophers but also by biologists. It is capable of being harmonized with the theistic standpoint, as interpreted, for example, by Professor Lloyd Morgan.

The theory of *Relativity*, like that of Emergent or Creative Evolution, has also aroused much discussion among theistic apologists in recent years. It is not easy to say whether *Relativity* is intended to be taken as a philosophical theory of the actual objective structure of the physical world. If it is to be so taken, then it is of significance for religion. But religion, in Professor Eddington's opinion, has nothing to fear from it. In fact it supports the ideas of the objective existence and creative activity of God.

The chief danger to religion, as Dr. HARRIS goes on to affirm, proceeds not so much from physical science as from the extravagant claims sometimes put forward by the *New Psychology*, inasmuch as it aims at being an entirely 'natural' or experimental science, like chemistry and physics. It is with mental states as such, and not with the metaphysical nature of the soul or mind, that the 'New Psychology' is concerned. And its point of view is subjective. It is concerned, not with God, but with human ideas and beliefs about God; not with the moral law, but with man's moral ideas and sentiments. Its leading conception is that of mental activity directed towards a biological 'end' or 'purpose.' To the soul it assigns a native energy of its own (*libido* or *hormé*), which is different in kind from physical energy, and capable of directing and controlling it.

Such a psychology, as Dr. HARRIS maintains, is inconsistent with atheism, and even involves some form of theism as its philosophic basis. On the other hand, he acknowledges that certain schools of the 'New Psychology' are antagonistic to religion. *Freudianism* is usually regarded as the most antagonistic. Yet a certain number of Freudian practitioners are orthodox practising Christians, and hold that their therapeutic method (psycho-analysis) may be as useful to pastors and teachers as it is to physicians. But how do they

reconcile Christianity with the pansexualism and the determinism usually associated with the Freudian psychology? There is, however, this to be added: the 'Oedipus' complex plays a much less prominent part in Freudian teaching than was formerly the case; and in Freudian practice mental therapy finds itself compelled to work on libertarian principles.

There appears to be no doubt that *Behaviourism*, which is the 'new psychology' of America, conflicts inherently and necessarily with all forms of religion. Dr. HARRIS characterizes it as a slightly Americanized version of the views of Clifford, Huxley, and Tyndall. It is a system of pure materialism based upon the assumption that man is a mindless and soulless automaton, actuated and directed entirely by physical forces. In its extreme form it denies the existence of subjective or mental states altogether. But although the Behaviourists have opened up new avenues of psychological research (their investigations of the mentality of apes may be cited), they have been losing prestige even among the experimental psychologists of America. It is being realized, for example, that an act of memory involves knowledge, not only of past facts, but also of the rememberer's soul or mind, the existence of which the Behaviourist denies.

We shall not follow Dr. HARRIS in his reference to *Christian Science*, which is so far behaviouristic in its denial of the reality of the mental state of pain; enough has been said to indicate the scope of his supplementary chapter.

'South India' is the great problem which is at present before the minds of Anglican Churchmen in this country, and raises the most drastic issues which are to be submitted to the coming Lambeth Conference of Bishops. There is hardly any book issued by leading Anglican writers which does not deal with this matter. What, then, is the South India problem? What are the proposals which have raised such a storm of controversy? In a book written to expound and examine these proposals,

South India Schemes, by the Rev. W. J. Sparrow SIMPSON, D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net), we have the proposals set forth clearly, and a very drastic criticism of them by an earnest Anglo-Catholic.

The South India United Church was formed in 1908 by the blending together of various Congregationalist and Presbyterian Communions. Having secured this union of non-episcopal ministries, which in itself, considering their original differences, was a remarkable achievement, the South India United Church desired to extend their Union to Communions possessing an Episcopal ministry. The Indian Episcopal Church shared this desire, and in 1919 a more or less informal meeting was held between ministers of the Anglican Communion in India and the South India United Church. The Anglican members asked for the acceptance of the historic episcopate, which they explained to mean 'acceptance of the fact of Episcopacy, and not any theory of its character.'

The members of the South India United Church asked for recognition of the universal priesthood of all believers. Both sides were prepared to unite, so far as ministry is concerned, in agreement that acceptance of the fact of the Episcopate does not involve the acceptance of any theory of the origin of episcopacy, or any doctrinal interpretation of the fact. It was further agreed that the terms of union should involve no Christian community in the necessity of disowning its past, and that it was no part of their duty to call in question the validity of each other's orders.

At first it was proposed that each of the two bodies should 'commission' the ministries of the other. But this idea was soon (and finally) put aside. Two alternative proposals remained. One was that all ministers in the United Church should accept Episcopal ordination. That was never seriously urged, since acceptance of it by non-episcopal ministers would involve a disowning of their past and an agreement that their ordination had been no ordination at all. The only possibility left was to accept the ministries of all the uniting Churches. The Joint-Committee therefore

recommended that the existing ministers of the three Churches, the Anglican, the South Indian (*i.e.* Presbyterian and Congregational), and the Wesleyan, should all be accepted as ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments in the Church after union. This would hold for fifty years (afterwards reduced to thirty). But at the close of this period no one should minister in the Church unless he had received regular Episcopal ordination.

This proposal, to accept both types of ministry as equally ministers of the Word and Sacraments, is explained to involve 'the practice by which members of either Church secure communion without question in the other Church, and ministers of either Church are free to invite ministers of the other Church to preside at Communion Services.' But it was also agreed that 'no minister ordained before the union shall minister temporarily in any church or congregation without the consent of the parish minister . . . any congregation accustomed to an episcopally ordained ministry will not either temporarily or permanently be placed in charge of a non-episcopally ordained minister unless all the communicant members of the congregation have been informed of the suggested appointment, and no one has signified his objection to such an arrangement.' Finally, while after thirty years all the ministers of the United Church are to be episcopally ordained, 'after this period of thirty years, the United Church will consider and decide the question of [such] exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry.'

No, not quite finally. There was also the important matter of Confirmation to be dealt with. And it was agreed that 'until the Synod of the Church shall frame general rules with regard to full or communicant membership, either the rite of Confirmation administered by a Bishop of the Church, or such a service of admission to full membership as was in use in the South India United Church before the union, or such a service for the recognition of new members as was in use in the Wesleyan Church in South India before the union, shall be employed in admitting persons

to full or communicant membership of the United Church, and persons so admitted shall be recognized as communicant throughout the whole Church.'

These are the main features of the South India scheme, a notable and (from any point of view) courageous effort to embody the aspirations after reunion which are in the hearts of men of goodwill in all the churches. It will be obvious that the scheme is vulnerable at certain points. And Dr. Sparrow SIMPSON does not shrink from the task of exposing this. But the most momentous feature of the proposals is the challenge they present to the Church of England, and especially to the Lambeth Conference. It is not any weakness in the scheme itself as a basis of reunion that is serious. The really serious thing is that the Anglo-Catholic section of the Church of England will have nothing to do with it. This is made abundantly clear by Dr. SIMPSON in his book. He has many criticisms to offer, but the only one that matters essentially is that, if these proposals were accepted, the Anglican Church would be committing itself to the 'Protestant' theory of the ministry. To allow a non-episcopally ordained minister to

celebrate the Eucharist—one, that is, who is not a priest, and who has not received his commission by Apostolic Succession from the Lord—would be an intolerable thing. The one thing that gives a priest authority to minister the Holy Supper is that he has received it by orderly succession from the Apostles, who received it from Christ Himself.

It is true that scholars like Dr. Streeter and Dr. A. C. Headlam assert that there is no evidence whatever in the New Testament for the theory of Apostolic Succession. And Dr. SIMPSON knows this, and deals with them, not very convincingly we fear, but still very honestly and fairly. He is, however, quite unmoved by their arguments. And whether they are right or not matters nothing for the present point, which is that not obscurely he hints that the acceptance of the South India scheme here may lead to a serious disruption of the Church of England. That is the issue that faces the Bishops at Lambeth. They have a difficult task set them. The whole world will watch with interest how they deal with it. And, we add very sincerely, all good men will wait and watch (and pray) with sympathy and goodwill.

The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day.

VI.

War.

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND E. A. BURROUGHS, D.D.,
BISHOP OF RIPON.

THE difficulty of determining the mind of our Lord on any problem of a social or political nature is sufficiently indicated by the way such topics as this are discussed again and again, without even the most earnest and best-informed Christians having yet arrived at one mind. Part, at least, of this difficulty arises out of what seems to have been an aim of the whole teaching of Jesus, viz. to leave the particular application of general

principles to the individual conscience. In this certainly He is followed by St. Paul, *e.g.*, in his discussion of 'meats offered to idols.' Again, the issue is always complicated by the extraordinarily different social and political conditions under which both our Lord and His early followers lived; not the least baffling difference being the fact that, under the Roman Empire, there was no such thing as public opinion in politics. The re-

sponsibility of the individual citizen for the government of his country, which to us is an axiom, would have seemed a paradox then.

No subject, perhaps, suffers so much from these limits set to modern inquiry into the mind of Jesus as that now before us—His teaching about war. Yet few are more urgently practical at the moment, when the sentiment (for it is hardly yet the conscience) of humanity is more generally alive to the importance of exorcising war than it ever has been, when the hope of success in this effort is still vivid, and when the penalties of failing to take this tide at the flood are so terrible, so certain, and so clear. The liveness of sentiment on the subject is illustrated by the immense output of 'war books,' after a period during which the late war was almost taboo to those who went through it. The absence of a real conscience about it is reflected (e.g.) in the vicissitudes of the Naval Disarmament Conference, and the contrast between the promise of its beginning and the very limited performance at its close. To substitute conscience for mere sentiment in such matters is the task of religious faith. Hence the urgent practical importance of any inquiry that may help to put behind our wavering pacific forces the pressure of definitely Christian conviction rather than merely humanitarian desire. It would, therefore, be immensely valuable if now at last the churches could arrive at a unanimous verdict as to the mind of our Master about war, and the consequent duty of the individual Christian.

Yet quite obviously that point, however desirable, has not yet been reached. In a recent important discussion on 'Christianity and War' by leading members of the Congregational Union, an address on 'The Teaching of Jesus' was followed immediately by two others, discussing the application of that teaching. They were described as 'the pacifist' and 'the non-pacifist' positions, and each speaker was arguing against the other. Thus even within a single denomination, and that one where, perhaps, pacifist leanings might be expected more than, say, in the Church of England, representative leaders still look different ways. So what Professor C. H. Dodd says, in opening his discussion of our Lord's teaching on that occasion, is the necessary starting-point for us as well:

'It is useless to look in the Gospels for such explicit teaching of our Lord about war as would set the question at rest for His followers. . . . Our study of the Gospels will not solve our concrete problems directly, but

will supply a background of religious and moral principles for the discussion of these problems.'¹

With so many other subjects before the Churches on which opinion is divided, and on which Christians are increasingly learning to agree to differ, I shall not, I hope, be expected to come down definitely myself on either the pacifist or the non-pacifist side. If I may roughly indicate my own position, as still a seeker, it is that, when I read the New Testament, it inclines me strongly to pacifism, but when I turn to the pleas of modern pacifists, I am driven rather violently the other way. Such a book, for instance, as Dr. C. J. Cadoux's admirably complete and well-documented survey of the whole field, *The Early Christian Attitude to War* (Headley Bros.), the date of which (1919) accounts largely for its predominant colour, seems to me positively dangerous to the cause which the writer has at heart. To me at least he seems to worry his evidence to death as he gives it, and to discount the surely relevant fact that some of the best and most thoughtful Christians in all ages, including our own, have been soldiers of untroubled conscience as well.

I.

To determine our Lord's mind on the subject of war is, as we have seen, peculiarly difficult because of the circumstances of His age.

On the one hand the problem as we envisage it simply does not arise. For us the question which matters is whether in any circumstances a Christian may rightly (a) adopt the profession of a soldier, (b) submit to the demands which his country may make upon any citizen for military service during a war. The second part of the question is the more serious, seeing that, as in the last war, it is almost certain that the whole able-bodied population will be involved. But our Lord lived under the *Pax Romana*—a political situation, within the Roman Empire, very like that which a successful and all-embracing League of Nations would produce in the civilized world to-day. The Roman army had virtually none but police duties (cf. the various contacts with it recorded in the New Testament), apart from those of defending the frontiers against

¹ *Christianity and War*. Six Addresses delivered at the Autumn Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, October 1929, p. 33. (London: Congregational Union, Inc.; price 1s.) I am much indebted to this timely booklet for help in focussing my own thought.

Barbary beyond. Augustus had advised his successors not to attempt to extend those frontiers, and this advice (Tacitus tells us) hardened into a rule. Aggression, even against barbarians, was simply not contemplated. It may have been unfortunate that soldiers and police had not yet come to be distinguished, so that society seemed to be organized on a military basis, as indeed it was. That was the meaning of 'the Empire.' But the Empire meant not war but peace; and that was why men accepted it so thankfully. If to the Jews, a recently conquered people, the presence of the Roman forces spelt repression, yet, on the other hand, the peculiar position of Judæa was recognized by the exemption of Jews, as such, from military service. Thus for the first generation of Christians our modern problem simply did not exist.

On the other hand, a specialized form of this problem touched our Lord's Jewish contemporaries closely. For in that pacified cosmopolitan world the Jews were about the only 'nationalists' in the modern sense. Hence their special privileges, accorded them by Rome, which recognized the need of peculiar treatment for a peculiar people. Incidentally, through this treatment the principle *Divide et impera* was brought to bear. For there emerged two main political parties not dissimilar to those which confront Great Britain in India to-day. The majority, including the Pharisees, accepted the *modus vivendi* with the suzerain power; but a spirit of 'non-co-operation' was endemic in the populace, and every now and then blazed into revolt. To many it was a matter of religion as well as of patriotism to have nothing to do with their Gentile rulers. Hence the interest displayed in our Lord's attitude to the question of paying tribute to Rome, and the recurrent desire of the populace to 'make him a king'—i.e. the leader of a nationalist revolt. (It was on the tribute question that Judas of Galilee had raised his standard some years before.) The famous reply, 'Render to Cæsar,' etc., was not just an inspired evasion and rebuke in one; it was an expression of our Lord's philosophy which at the same time gave His political views. He ranged Himself with the Pharisees on the side of non-resistance to and recognition of Roman sovereignty. But He did so in terms which showed how secondary, in His eyes, were all merely political arrangements and even grievances compared with the concerns of the Kingdom of Heaven. He would not touch on politics without bringing in religion. The same point emerges from the curious reference to the

Galileans 'whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices.' The political and the speculative aspects of the incident are alike swept aside. They are nothing compared with the one real issue, as He saw it: would God's people repent towards God in time? (Lk 13¹⁻³).¹

The Jews thus had their own problem of 'non-resistance.' But clearly such incidents cannot be pressed into service as evidence bearing on that problem as it faces us. For such 'non-resistance' is wholly on another plane from that which the modern pacifist recommends. It represents political common sense rather than political idealism. It is the same attitude as St. Paul expounds more fully in Ro 13: 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for the powers that be are ordained of God. . . . For this cause pay ye tribute also, for they are God's ministers, attending continually to this very thing.' Note that 'this very thing' is the avenging of evil *with violence*—'he beareth *not the sword* to no purpose.' If our Lord is to be claimed as, in the full modern sense, a 'non-resister,' He was at least inconsistent in recommending the support, by tax-paying, of a system quite openly dependent on military force. But, of course, the real point is that both He and His first followers are relatively uninterested in issues of that sort. As Lecky says, and Dr. Cadoux admits in quoting him: 'The opinions of the Christians of the first three centuries were usually formed without any regard to the necessities of civil or political life.'² This may partly arise from the notion that only an 'Interimsethik' was needed, instead of a complete adjustment to their social context. For the apocalyptic outlook long survived the change of emphasis revealed in the later writings of St. Paul. More likely it is due to the detachment of the plane of our Lord's thought from that on which matter-of-fact human thought was moving. 'My kingdom is not of this world.' And this detachment was encouraged in His followers by the almost complete severance, under the Empire, between the average citizen and the machinery of government. There is therefore the maximum reason for caution in converting our Lord's words to His first followers into political precepts binding on ourselves.

¹ Dr. Cadoux's effort to use the Pilate episode is characteristic. Our Lord, he says, 'is not anxious to exact from Pilate a penalty' for this political outrage—and this is added support for 'non-resistance'! Incidentally, it is not Pilate's guilt but that of his victims that is referred to and brushed aside.

² *European Morals*, ii. 39.

II.

Yet, when all this has been said, His own ideal of human relationships is unmistakable; and it is one incapable either of being realized by 'violent' means or of coexisting with a state of society based, however disguisedly, on force. Our Lord came to establish a society in which one universally valid set of human relationships would supersede all the various other groupings which complicate the world of to-day. In His divine society everything would hinge on the equal relation of all men to God as their Father in heaven. So, as St. Paul was quick to see, in the Christian society 'there can be (*οὐκ ἔνι*) no such distinctions as Jew or Greek, slave or free, male or female' (Gal 3²⁸); and so, with this new spiritual kinship as the social goal, nothing can be right in the process of getting there which would hinder the growth of the spirit on which success depends.

Briefly, as the goal is what Harnack calls 'infinite love in ordinary intercourse,' love, not force, must be the uniform means of approach. 'The kingdom of heaven' may have to be 'taken by storm' by the moral earnestness of those who desire to enter it: but it cannot be brought nearer by force; nor can force be used to bring others into it. For force, more than anything, banishes love and stirs up antagonism and fear together. Part at least of the meaning of the third Temptation (Mt 4) is the refusal of our Lord at the very outset to use any means to win His kingdom which were inconsistent with its being the kingdom of God—that is, of infinite and holy love. War, therefore, can never be a Christian method of promoting any Christian cause; the chief objection to it lying not so much in the horrors and cruelties involved (cf., again, the incident of Pilate and the Galileans), but in the fact that the use of force produces psychological reactions (fear and resentment, especially) which impel to the further use of force. And this works cumulatively, leading both aggressor and victim further from the true human goal, which is love, until the process is stopped by some one who refuses to meet force with force.

This is what lies behind the whole of our Lord's familiar teaching about 'non-resistance,' in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere. And though, in the nature of things, He could only speak of the relations of individuals—of Christians to non-Christians, especially, in a hostile social environment—the pacifist is surely right in rejecting the plea that such teaching affects men only in their private capacity. On the one hand, 'we are all

members one of another,' under whatever political conditions; and it is through the relations of individuals that society itself is gradually changed. ('Ye are the salt of the earth,' etc.) On the other hand, what reverses progress when personal relationships only are infected must do so still more seriously when communities take up the wrong mutual attitude, as in war. For to the hardening of distinctions (e.g. of race or class) which 'the kingdom of heaven' overrides there are added the embitterment and poisoning of masses of individual lives. If the distinctive task of the Christian is to reverse what seems to be the natural process,—'Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good,'—*a fortiori* he must not do anything to intensify that process. And it is because 'resisting' evil, in the sense of meeting force with force, only multiplies it, while 'non-resistance' may, and often does, undermine and check it, that non-resistance is central in the programme of Christ. So far from 'doing evil that good may come,' we are to accept injury to ourselves, if need be, with a view to 'short-circuiting,' so to speak, the sway of evil in the world.

Here it is important to note the great difference between our Lord's conception of 'non-resistance' and that of the Pharisees, with whose political programme in one sense He agrees. Their acceptance of the inevitable was only political opportunism. Had successful rebellion become practical politics, they would no doubt have joined the Zealots. They shared to the full the traditional 'rancorous nationalism' of the Jew. 'This was indeed,' says Professor Dodd, 'the weakness of the Pharisees as religious guides of the nation during the last fatal half-century.' Seeing the fatal consequences of Zealotry, they 'preached non-resistance; but they did nothing to correct the inward passions which gave Zealotry its appeal.'¹ But Jesus not only differentiates His type of non-resistance by turning it into generosity: 'If your shirt is claimed by a litigant, give him your cloak too; if an official claims you as guide or porter, go with him twice as far as you are obliged.' He demands that such generosity shall have love as its source—the same indiscriminate love as God shows towards men. 'Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you, that you may become sons of your Father which is in heaven. . . .' Only so can His kingdom come 'as in heaven, so on earth.'

In the face of this whole underlying philosophy of love, it seems pointless to discuss the few passages which are regularly quoted to rebut the full-

¹ *Christianity and War*, p. 36.

blooded pacifist interpretation of our Lord's teaching. 'I came not to bring peace, but a sword.' 'But now (after the Last Supper: Lk 22³⁶) let him that hath none sell his cloak and buy a sword,' etc. The words which seem to sweep all such counterblasts aside are those spoken to Peter still later on the night of the betrayal: 'Put back thy sword into its place, for all who take the sword shall perish by the sword' (Mt 22⁵²). This is true both to human nature and to military history. 'Militarism' in any form sooner or later defeats itself, and 'the meek' do in the end 'inherit the earth.' Tertullian's comment on the passage shows that, as early as A.D. 200, when the problem of military service was already a live and growing one for Christians, some Christians at any rate saw in it a condemnation of all war: 'the Lord, in disarming Peter, ungirded every soldier' (Tert. *Idol.* 19). Dr. Cadoux is right in his claim that the growth of the Christian community depends on 'two gradual processes,' which have to 'go on *pari passu*: firstly, a gradual diminution in the number of those who use violence to restrain wrong, and, secondly, a gradual diminution in the number of those who seem to them to need forcible restraint.'¹

And each generation proves more clearly that, man being what he is, the child of God, moral influences can do more and better things with him than force. It is the truth dimly foreshadowed in Æsop's fable of the sun and the wind, and clearly stated in an Eastern proverb: 'Hatred ceaseth not by hatred at any time, hatred ceaseth only by love.'

Admittedly, then, no Christian as such, and no Christian society as such, could ever consistently resort to war as a means to any Christian end; and, if an end is not Christian, it is not for the Christian, as such, to seek it. It is difficult in these days to imagine any Church, except possibly the one which has so often done so in the past, and which has lately regained its 'temporal sovereignty,' using again the weapons of the world or the 'secular arm' in the supposed interest of the Kingdom of God. When Dr. Cadoux criticises non-pacifist Christians as 'realizing the impossibility of finding any sanction for war in the Gospels' and yet 'clinging to the belief that war is *in these days a Christian duty*'² he simply confuses the issue, if indeed he realizes what it is.

No modern Christian, especially with the experience of the last fifteen years before him, could think of 'war in these days as a Christian duty.'

But many Christians realize that, the world being still what it is, the admittedly sub-Christian society to which, as citizens, they belong, may, as part of the entail of evil from the past, find itself involved in a situation in which *its* duty, in the sense of the least objectionable of the courses open to it, might once more seem to be to take up arms, as Belgium and Great Britain did in 1914. And then the Christian individual would have to ask himself whether by co-operation or abstention he could best promote his Master's interests: a point which, as we have seen, cannot be settled simply by his Master's recorded words. If he decided to serve as a soldier, he would not be 'clinging to the belief that war is a Christian duty': he would (assuming his decision to be honest and conscientious) be merely taking up his own cross and bearing his own share of the piled-up sin of the world. And so, too, would the truly conscientious objector be doing.

III.

So we come to the burning practical problem which so exercises the world to-day, and which every Christian has to be ready to solve in practice for himself if another war comes. Has the time arrived for the ideal which shines out from our Lord's whole philosophy to be treated as every Christian's hard-and-fast rule? And if we cannot lay down the law for every Christian in every situation, how is the individual to decide for himself, as Christ apparently wills him to do?

The application of the Christian ideal in particular circumstances would appear to depend mainly on three things:

- (1) the stage of ethical development at which the whole society concerned has arrived;
- (2) the moral and spiritual illumination of the individual Christian whose decision is called for; and
- (3) the interests of the Christian cause, viewed as objectively as, in the circumstances, an individual can, and (that it may be so) looked at in company with the Christian body itself.

Brief comment on these three principles must suffice.

(1) What is admittedly an absolute rule for and within the Christian community may be one which, in a sub-Christian society, Christians cannot literally apply without failing in their equally admitted duty to the larger community to which they also belong. There will always be the question, which

¹ Cadoux, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

in fact was asked in first-century Rome, 'Can a good Christian be a good citizen as well?' And here our Lord, with His 'Render unto Cæsar . . .', brings, not the peace of a ready-made answer, but the sword of repeated personal decisions.

It is true that in A.D. 66, when the Jews did at last revolt from Cæsar, the Jewish Christians, acting, as they believed, on our Lord's advice to 'flee to the mountains,' withdrew to a Gentile city and took no part in the campaign (cf. Lk 21²⁰⁻²⁴). For some it must have been very hard to become 'conscientious objectors' in this way; but others must equally have realized that already the centre of gravity of the Christian world had shifted from Jerusalem to Rome, and that to identify themselves still with Jewish nationalism would have been not merely suicidal but unfaithful to Christ. And anyhow 'Submit yourselves . . . unto the king (the emperor) as supreme' (1 P 2) was an apostolic injunction. Thus the attitude of the Jewish Christians towards the invasion of Vespasian offers no guidance relevant, say, to the problem that faced Belgian Christians in August 1914.

It is equally true that, by the end of the second century, it was becoming increasingly usual for Christians to enter the imperial forces, quite apart from the conversion of soldiers: which proves that, so far, military service had not come to be regarded by the Church as *ipso facto* inconsistent with the Christian profession. Tertullian, who (as we have seen) was himself anti-militarist, tells the story of the 'Thundering Legion' in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and shows that many were taking up soldiering in his day. What put him against the practice seems rather to have been the pagan incidentals of service than the essential conditions of army life; and so again his testimony decides nothing. In the course of the third century the number of Christian soldiers must have multiplied greatly, to judge by the number of military martyrs. And these martyrdoms themselves attest that it was no slackness of conscience or inconsistency that led such men to serve. More probably, in view of the dangers threatening the Empire and all that it stood for in the world, their presence in the armies represents a conscientious attempt to go on 'rendering unto Cæsar' in so far as Cæsar would at the same time let them 'render unto God.'

When one remembers how St. Paul accepts without question the institution of slavery, even in Christian households—merely premising that the Christian slave of a Christian owner (like Onesimus after his return) will be treated as a

brother beloved, and will act in the same way by his master; when one finds him apparently indifferent as to whether a slave, on his conversion, shall or shall not try to become free, though he deprecates a freeman selling himself into slavery (cf. 1 Co 7²⁰⁻²⁴); it is difficult not to picture him, *in the then state and organisation of society*, saying much the same of military service. 'Wast thou called as a soldier? Do not worry about it. And even if thou hast a chance of escaping, it may be better to use the opportunities of that state of life.' (The Greek of v.²¹ is, of course, ambiguous.)

But is the same attitude *still* consistent with Christianity now? That is the real point. There came a time when slavery stood self-condemned before a gradually awakened and educated Christian conscience; and then slavery had to go. The abolitionists had to fight for their principles; but those principles are now taken for granted by the civilized world. Some day war will be in the same position. And some of the abolitionists in this field—the pacifists of to-day—will have to assert their convictions and gradually drive out what they regard as the opportunism of the rest. But has that time come? Could the abolition of slavery have been effected even in England before the Evangelical Revival? If public opinion had not been fairly ripe for conversion, would the abolitionists have effected anything by merely manumitting all their own slaves, and refusing dividends earned in part by slave labour? If public opinion is not yet ripe for a complete renunciation of war in any circumstances whatsoever—and that is what pacifism involves—are the convinced Christians of our own generation a strong enough force to convert it merely by refusing *en masse* (supposing that we could all come to one mind and conscience on the subject) to take up arms in any circumstances themselves? Unquestionably a *really united* Christian refusal would have an effect out of all proportion to the numbers involved. But is there any present prospect of a united protest—which, in this case above all, means an international as well as a pandenominational one? And if not, would the Church really be wise to preach pacifism, in the professional sense, as part of the duty of every Christian, when she cannot prove that either our Lord or the New Testament writers, or those of the first Christian centuries, went so far?

What we all can do and must do is (a) to live right up to the stage of enlightenment actually reached, and part with the world at once if it tries to move backwards, and (b) to use every means to

'press on unto perfection' and lead the community to the next higher stage, with the Mind of Christ as the test and goal of progress. And here it should be obvious that what was consistent with Christian duty in 1914-18 need not necessarily be so in the case of 'the next war.' For one thing, the world has learned much about the futility of war, of its inevitably debasing effects on character except when there is the saving grace of Christ, and of its incalculable by-products in the form of both economic and psychological dislocation and misery. We also know now that war in the twentieth century is infinitely more terrible and less capable of idealization, as well as vaster in its sweep, than war in any previous age, and that the next war, if it comes, will be immeasurably worse than the last. And we know that, if 'the war to end war' does have a successor, human nature will go into it ashamed and humiliated and paralysed by self-despair, so that such a war will have even less chance of doing good indirectly than the last war, of which so much was hoped at the time.

Above all, we know that, through the only good by-product of that war so far apparent in the moral and political sphere—the recognition of all-round international obligations, limiting the sovereignty of every self-respecting state, enshrined in the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Pact for the Renunciation of War as an instrument of policy—no new war can break out under at all the same conditions as the old. Practically every possible belligerent is a signatory of the Covenant or of the Pact, or of both. It will be the duty of Christian citizens of such countries to inquire whether their Government of that day is faithfully fulfilling its obligations. Precipitate action of any sort will be *prima facie* evidence of bad faith. And here, so far from evading responsibility with the old immoral yet intelligible cry, 'My country right or wrong,' it will (I submit) be the duty not of Christians only but of every patriot, for the sake of his country's political honour as well as of the principles of Jesus Christ, to refuse his support or of acquiescence in any warlike action which has not been preceded by an honest and patient effort to use all the existing machinery for peaceful settlement. In other words, there is a far greater likelihood of the Churches having to point and follow the way of 'conscientious objection' in any future war than ever in the past.

The stage of development reached so far, and the Christian obligations consonant with it, seem to me to be admirably registered in the unanimous Resolution passed in September 1929 at Avignon

by the International Management Committee of the 'World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches,' and since then adopted by the British Council of the Alliance. (The Alliance represents the Christian Churches, other than the Roman Church, of thirty-one nations, and the British Council has the same scope in Great Britain and Ireland.)

1. We whole-heartedly welcome the solemn declaration made by the leading statesmen of the world in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another, and agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.
2. We believe that war considered as an institution for the settlement of international disputes is incompatible with the mind and method of Christ, and therefore incompatible with the mind and method of His Church.
3. While convinced that the time must come for the revision of existing treaties in the interests of peace, we maintain that all disputes and conflicts between nations, for which no solution can be found through diplomacy or conciliation, ought to be settled or solved through arbitration, whether by the World Court or by some other tribunal mutually agreed. For this purpose we desire the immediate completion of such organizations as will provide means for pacific settlement of every kind of international dispute and will enthrone justice among all peoples.
4. We earnestly appeal to the respective authorities of all Christian communions to declare in unmistakable terms that they will not countenance, nor assist in any way in, any war with regard to which the Government of their country has refused a *bona fide* offer to submit the dispute to arbitration.

The next step before the churches now would seem to be to make such declarations as § 4 envisages, and to start educating their members for action along such lines. Here pacifists and non-pacifists can surely join forces. It is interesting to note that, at an International Youth Conference held in Switzerland under the auspices of the World Alliance, only three weeks before the Avignon

meeting, the young people, after a preamble in caustic terms condemning the Churches for failure in their duty during the late war and since, urged them to define their attitude towards war in the terms originally adopted by the 'Copec' Conference of 1924:

'That the Churches should unreservedly condemn, and refuse to support in any way, a war waged before the matter in dispute has been submitted to an arbitral tribunal, or in defiance of the decision of such a tribunal.'

This suggests that there is at present a risk of Christians lagging even behind the politicians, just as the politicians are apt in practice to shirk the consequences of documents to which they have set their hands. At the least it is the duty of the Christian community, as such, to refuse to fall below the existing high-water mark of political theory, and to satisfy themselves, before joining in any conflict, that their country really did use all provided means of avoiding it. Then, having got the existing high-water mark really respected, we shall have to go on to force it higher.

IV.

Much shorter treatment must suffice for the other two considerations on which, as has been previously suggested, the application of the Christian ideal must depend: viz. (2) the moral and spiritual illumination of the individual Christian called on to decide, and (3) the interests of the Christian cause itself, viewed as objectively as possible.

Under (2), the ruling principle would seem to be two-sided. First, 'let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.' A really conscientious and whole-hearted acceptance of an intrinsically lower ideal may be more 'Christian' than an artificial or 'second-hand' adhesion to an intrinsically higher. No one would defend the coward who pleaded 'conscientious objection.' But it might be better for one who suspected that his own 'objection' was really cowardice to take up *the other* cross, by enlisting, rather than remain 'of doubtful mind.' Refusal to fight in a case where (*ex hypothesi*) the fighting has been forced on one's country, on the ground that one had been brought up to pacifism, would also, I think, be indefensible. One would have to be personally convinced that to fight is inevitably wrong; and in this case a man's duty would be clear—to prove his conviction by acting on it. But, secondly, 'Who art thou that

judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth.' St. Paul's handling of 'conscience' in the matter of 'meats offered to idols' is apt guidance for the parallel here. Just as the real 'conscientious objector' must never be penalized, so neither must he say to his brother who fights: 'I have a Christian conscience, and you have not.' Yet, though each must be free from the other's conscience, he must perpetually bring his own to the touchstone of the mind of Christ. 'Jesus brings us into conflict with social duties to which we all wish to cling.'¹ When the world has already moved so far towards outlawing war, it cannot but become increasingly difficult for any instructed Christian to undertake to fight with anything like 'full persuasion in his own mind': and the more he knows of the mind of Christ, the harder it is likely to be.

(3) At the same time, even the most convinced, either way, will have to remember that 'none of us liveth unto himself.' In other words, individual conviction must still be related, if not subordinated, to the good of the Christian whole. A Christian has to consider not only the effect on his own conscience, say, of his consenting to fight, but the effect of either consent or refusal on the good name of the Christian Church. 'I do all things with an eye to the gospel,' says St. Paul; and it is at least arguable that a general outburst of Christian pacifism might do more to thwart the gospel than the continued participation of Christians in war. 'Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man *for the Lord's sake*; whether it be to the king as supreme . . .' That surely covered military service then; and, if it were in the Lord's interests for Christians not to stand apart from the rest of the nation they belong to, it would cover it now. Perhaps the maximum of self-crucifixion would be reached by the man who, himself a real conscientious objector, decided to fight after all, lest conscientious objection on his part should prejudice the appeal of his Master to his fellow-men. The Jews could afford to be known and treated as a 'peculiar people,' with special exemptions. But as such they could never have evangelized the world. The Christian, with his primary task of getting alongside and winning others, cannot afford to erect a barrier of misunderstanding between himself and them by seeming to refuse crosses which they have to bear, even though he claim to be bearing a greater.

The conclusion of the whole matter I cannot

¹ William Herrmann, *Essays on the Social Gospel*, Eng. tr., p. 163 (quoted by Cadoux).

put better than in some words of Mr. George Shillito in the booklet to which I have so often referred :

'Through a slowly clarifying inward vision we move to moral capacity . . . Striving towards right decisions, men and nations become great,—
"Life's business being just the terrible choice."

. . .

'There are no short cuts out of the embarrassment created by ages of human sin, and ignorance, and catastrophe. . . .

'The task to which we are called is not the melodramatic and impossible performance of downing arms, but a wise, persistent, whole-hearted evangelisation of all the nations of the world.' ¹

¹ *Christianity and War*, pp. 59-60.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

IV. The Contribution of Germany to Church History: Ancient Church and Reformation.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES MACKINNON, PH.D., D.D., EDINBURGH.

I.

GERMANY's contribution to the literature of Church History is very extensive, and in two short articles one can only indicate its main content and characteristics. Even so, considerations of space have compelled the writer to limit this survey to the two most formative periods of Church History—those of the rise and development of the Catholic Church and of the Reformation.

In their treatment of Church History the Germans display no little initiative in the formulation of problems and theories relative to the subject-matter of the various periods. The discussion of these problems and theories has stimulated inquiry and has contributed to a fresh elucidation of a given theme or movement. The old method of the academic disputation has been transferred from the rostrum to the study and the press, and has expressed itself in the controversial tone of many works in all departments of German science, and not least in that of Church History. The contentious, doctrinaire spirit is at times unduly obtrusive. The method has thus its drawbacks inasmuch as the subjective element, as revealed in individual temperament and conviction, is apt to affect the objective treatment of the subject in question. As in other departments of scientific activity, it has left, as a memorial of misdirected effort, a bulky record of exploded or greatly modified theories. For instance, the Tübingen theory of

the early development of Christianity under the influence of the Jewish-Christian and the Pauline-Gentile antithesis, resulting in the synthesis of the Fourth Gospel, which is assigned to the second half of the second century. On the whole, however, the method has substantially contributed to the advancement of historical knowledge.

The Germans are strong in textual criticism. They have long realized the importance of correct texts, and have devoted immense learning and labour to the production of critical and competently annotated editions of the sources of the various epochs of Church History—particularly those of the Ancient Church and the Reformation. Equally admirable is their application of the critical spirit in the exposure of the unauthentic material in which certain periods of Church History abound. They have, further, grasped the fundamental truth that Church History is not an isolated phenomenon and can only be adequately elucidated in relation to the general history of the time. In the early period, for instance, the development of Christian thought and institutions was largely influenced by Hellenism and the constitution of the Roman Empire, and the more recent German historical literature shows ample evidence of the comprehension of this cardinal fact.

The German contribution to Church History in recent times also reveals the striving to apply to

this department of investigation the same scientific method as is observed in the treatment of secular history. There is apparent the same effort to use only critically sifted sources and to differentiate, in the scientific spirit, between fact and belief. The dogmatic method of writing Church History has thus tended, in increasing degree, to give place to the factual and scientific one except in the case of those, particularly of the extreme Roman Catholic persuasion, who still write from the dogmatic standpoint that the history of the Church, as ruled by the papacy, is the history of an infallible institution which has never essentially erred and cannot, in fact, do so.

Very remarkable is the number of German Church historians who have attempted a survey of the whole course of Christian history or covered a large part of it. Among these general histories the *Lehrbuch* or Compendium of Gieseler is still useful in virtue especially of its copious quotations from the sources. The same claim may be made for Hase's compilation. It is also still worth while to consult the more voluminous work of Neander, which extends down to the fifteenth century and, under Schleiermacher's influence, combines deep religious feeling with intimate knowledge of the sources. Baur's masterly survey, especially of the early period, gave a great stimulus to the studies of other writers and on this account has also to be reckoned with. Among the general histories written from the Roman Catholic point of view the works of Alzog, Schmidt, Hergenröther in the recent revision of Kirsch, Funk (recently revised by Bihlmeyer) are the most outstanding. Among more recent Protestant writers the handbooks of Kurtz and Moeller have had a wide circulation both in the original German and in English translations. They are, however, being superseded by fresh surveys like those of K. Müller, Achelis, Heussi, von Schubert, and the Handbook by various writers edited by Gust. Krüger, who, along with Preuschen, has contributed the first part on the Ancient Church. K. Müller's work, which reaches the seventeenth century, remains the standard guide in German for the student of general Church History, and it is regrettable that it has not hitherto found an English translator. Mirbt's collection of documents relative to the papacy and Roman Catholicism (1924) is a handy guide to the more important sources.

Turning now to the distinctive epochs of Church History, the Germans have produced a great amount of original work on the Primitive Church. For this period the New Testament writings are the primary sources, and in the critical treatment of these for

historical purposes they have taken both the initiative and the leading part. Weizsäcker's work on the *Apostolic Age* (Eng. tr., 1894) is still valuable, and Wernle's *Beginnings of Christianity* (Eng. tr., 1903-04) is brilliant, whilst Pfeiderer (*Urchristenthum*, 1902) and Knopf's *Nachapostolische Zeitalter* (1905) still deserve the attention of the student. Wernle's 'Jesus und Paulus'¹ is a forcible refutation of Bousset's contention (*Kyrios Christos*, 1913) that Paul's Christianity was largely derived from Hellenist sources. Indispensable is the *Urchristenthum* of J. Weiss (1915), which reviews the origins with an illuminating erudition and charm of style. The latest contribution—that of Schlatter—(*Geschichte der ersten Christenheit*, 1927), which dispenses with critical notes, rather disappoints the inquiring student. Poland (*Griechische Vereinswesen*, 1909) is a valuable aid to the discussion of the question of the influence of the Guilds and Fraternities of the Græco-Roman world on the organization of the early Christian community. On the constitution of the early Church, Sohm's *Kirchenrecht* (i. 1892), Loening's *Die Gemeinde Verfassung des Urchristenthums* (1889), and Harnack's *Entstehung der Kirchenverfassung* (1910, Eng. tr. 1910) are of great value. Harnack is at issue with Sohm, who maintains that the primitive community, as a purely spiritual body, was not, and could not, be an organized association in the legal sense, with functionaries possessing a recognized authority in virtue of their office. Against this extreme Lutheran spiritualism, Harnack emphasizes with no little force the authoritative position of the Twelve and other functionaries in the community. He is less successful in an attempt, under the influence of Hatch, to differentiate between the offices of presbyter and bishop, whom he transforms into an administrative functionary. His thesis has not been generally accepted, and the identity of these functionaries may still be said to be the established view. The Christian life of the early community has been admirably depicted by Dobschütz (*Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, Eng. tr., 1904). In connexion with this subject it is advisable to consult Friedländer's *Sittengeschichte Roms* (Eng. tr. from the seventh German edition, under the title *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*).

Passing to the Ancient Catholic Church and its development during the first four centuries, German scholars have rendered sterling service in the critical treatment of this lengthy period, on which the discovery of lost documents (the Didache, the Apology of Aristides, the Acts of Paul, certain

¹ *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* (1915).

writings of Irenæus, Hippolytus, Methodius, Priscillian, Nestorius, etc.) has thrown new light. For an introduction to the earlier part of this literature the student is greatly indebted to Harnack's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (1893) and his *Chronologie* (1904-07), and to Bardenheuer's volumes on the same subject (1902-24), and that of Schanz-Krüger for the Latin writers. To the Vienna Academy we owe the series of Latin Ecclesiastical Writers (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* from 1866 onwards); to the Prussian Academy the series of Greek writers (from 1897 onwards), which includes Schwartz's standard edition of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius and competent editions of Theodoret, Gelasius, Philostorgius, and Epiphanius. The long series of *Texte und Untersuchungen*, corresponding to the English *Texts and Studies*, provides a varied repertory of studies of particular writers and themes. Valuable contributions to the elucidation of the period are also to be found in the various German theological journals and the numerous *Festschriften* in honour of distinguished German theologians. As an example of the critical study of groups of writers stand out the edition of the Apostolic Fathers by Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn, (1877-78) and Funk's handy collection of these writings (1906). The number of monographs on individual writers is almost bewildering, and it must suffice to mention Zahn on Ignatius (1875) and Hermas (1868), Harnack on the Didache (1886), Baumeister on the Ethik of Hermas (1912), Bonwetsch on the Theology of Irenæus (1925), Loofs on Paul of Samosata (1924). Böckh's *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* includes a collection of Christian inscriptions, which Mommsen has almost entirely excluded from the *Corpus Ins. Lat.*

Recent systematic works of value on the period are available in those of Achelis (*Christenthum der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, 1912), Haase (*Altchristliche Kirchengeschichte nach orientalischen Quellen*, 1925), von Soden (*Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*, 1919). The older works of Baur (*Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, 1860, Eng. tr. 1878) and A. Ritschl (*Entstehung der alt-katholischen Kirche*, 1857) are important for the stimulus imparted to other historians. Ritschl took the initiative in the reaction against the distinctive standpoint of Baur, who, under the influence of the Hegelian philosophy, built his work on the very questionable assumption of the long-drawn-out antithesis between Jewish-Christian and Pauline Christianity. In the department of the History of Dogma the more recent works of

Harnack, Seeberg, Loofs, and Dörner are of capital importance. Those of Harnack and Loofs belong to the Liberal School. Harnack in his detailed and masterly exposition frankly recognizes the decisive influence of Hellenist thought, which gradually moulded ecclesiastical doctrine and, in the acute form of this influence, found expression in Christian Gnosticism. Hence what he calls the secularization or Hellenization, in varying degree, of Christian thought throughout the period preceding the General Councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, whose history has been minutely, though not always objectively recounted by the Roman Catholic, Hefele (*Concilien Geschichte*², 1877). This contention is substantially founded. Its influence is already apparent, indeed, in the Fourth Gospel, though Harnack recognizes that it forms only one element in the development of ancient Catholic thought, which in its own subjective fashion sought to embody and preserve the evangelical-Apostolic traditions. Roman Catholic writers like Ehrhard, on the other hand, repudiate such influence, and very hazardously maintain the Divine character of the developing Catholic Church as 'the genuine fruit of primitive Christianity' (*Urchristenthum und Katholicismus*, 1925). For the Protestant Sohm, on the contrary, who approaches the subject from the constitutional point of view, it is a complete aberration from the primitive model (*Wesen und Ursprung des Katholicismus*, 1912).

The study of the Gnostic movement both as a system of thought and in its influence—positive and negative—on the Catholic Church, to which Harnack's thesis gave an impulse, has entered on a new phase in works like Bousset's *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (1907), the first volume of Müller's *Kirchengeschichte* and the 'Beiträge zum Verständnis der valentinianischen Gnosis',¹ Schmidt's edition of *Pistis Sophia* (1925), Harnack's *Marcion* (1921), Leisegang's *Gnosis* (1924), and the older work of Anz, *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnosticismus* (1897). For the contemporary but widely different anti-ecclesiastical movement known as Montanism, the work of Bonwetsch (*Geschichte des Montanismus*, 1881) is still the standard one in German.

On the Christian mission in the Græco-Roman world Harnack opened up a new perspective in his *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christenthums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (fourth edition, 1924, Eng. tr. by Moffatt), in which, improving on Neander, he luminously, if not exhaustively, reviewed the subject from the relative evidence. The book has also had the merit of fostering inquiry,

¹ *Nachr. Gott. Ges. Wiss.*, 1920.

outside as well as within Germany, into this hitherto largely neglected, but highly important branch of Church History. Much labour has, on the other hand, been expended on the long, if intermittent, persecution of the Christians to which the Christian mission gave rise, and on the relation of the Ancient Church and the Empire. Mommsen led the way to a truer conception of the early persecutions in his article in the *Historische Zeitschrift* on 'Der Religions-frevel nach römischen Recht,' though his thesis, that the earlier persecution was purely a matter of the police jurisdiction of the local magistrate, not of State ordinance, has recently been subjected to some criticism—by O. Sild, for instance, in *Das altchristliche Martyrium* (1920) and Heinze in *Tertullian's Apologeticum* (1910).

Recent writers like Geffcken (*Das Christenthum im Kampf mit der Griechischen-Römischen Welt*, 1920), Schönaich (*Kämpfe zwischen Römertum und Christenthum*, 1927), Stade on the Diocletian Persecution (1926), Knipping on the Edict of Milan (1922), have made substantial contributions which have superseded the older works of Uhlhorn (1879), Wieseler (1878), and Linsenmayer (1905). Schiller's *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit* (1883) is also helpful for the attitude of the various emperors. In this connexion the works of the Apologists and their opponents have been the object of intensive study. Among the large number of valuable monographs it must suffice to mention those of Geffcken (*Zwei Griechische Apologeten*), of Wehofer (1897), Engelhardt (1878) and Flemming (1883), on Justin Martyr; Schwartz on Athenagoras; Keim (1873), Glöckner (1924), and Stange (1926) on Celsus and Origen; Schmidt on Plotinus in relation to Christianity (1901), Harnack on Porphyry (1916). The more notable of the general works dealing with the fall of Paganism are those of Schulze (*Geschichte des Untergangs des G.-R. Heidenthums*), especially of Seeck (*Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, 1895-1920), whose estimate of Christianity has been sharply criticised by Krüger.¹

The development of the ecclesiastical constitution has been the object of much inquiry and discussion in the works on *Kirchenrecht* (Sohm, Harnack,

Bickell, Loening, etc.), and in the monographs on parts of the subject. Among the latter are important contributions like Zahn's *Ignatius*, Harnack's edition of the Original Sources of the Apostolic Canons in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, ii. (Eng. tr. by Wheatley, 1895), Döllinger's *Hippolytus und Kallistus* (tr. by Plummer, 1876), Rolfs' 'Kallistus' (*Texte und Unters.* xi. 1893), O. Ritschl (1885) and Goetz (1896) on Cyprian, Schwartz's *Kaiser Konstantin und die Christliche Kirche* (1913) and the *Acta Conciliorum oecumenicorum* (1914f.). A systematic discussion in German of the influence of the organization and administration of the Roman Empire on the development of the ecclesiastical constitution is still, as far as I know, a desideratum. On the other hand, there is a considerable amount of recent literature on the Roman Primacy, which is elucidated by Grill (*Primat des Petrus*, 1904), Schnitzer (*Hat Jesus das Papstthum gestiftet?*, 1910), Caspar (*Primat des Petrus*, 1927), Lietzmann (*Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, 1927), in which the burning questions of the authenticity and interpretation of Mt 16^{18, 19} and the sojourn of Peter in Rome, etc., are discussed.

In other departments of Ancient Church History it must suffice to mention the meritorious contributions to the early history of monasticism of Weingarten (1877), Reitzenstein (1914), Bousset (1923), Crum and Ehrhard (1915), Laun (1925), Peradse (1927). On church life, discipline, and worship those of Lucius, *Anfänge des Heiligenkults*, edited by Aurich (1904), Adam's, Poschmann's, and Brewer's expositions of the ecclesiastical remission of sins, Holl's essay on 'Fasts in the Ancient Greek Church,' that of Kalsbach on the institution of the office of deaconess, Preisker and K. Müller on marriage. On the liturgy of the Ancient Church see the recent works of Dölger, Schermann, Lietzmann, Völker, Baumstark, and Mohlberg. Ecclesiastical archaeology has also received additions from Kaufmann (*Handbuch der Christlichen Archäologie*, 1922), Schultze (*Grundriss der Christ. Archäologie*, 1919), Wulff (*Die alte Christ. Kunst*, 1917), v. Sybel (*Frühchrist. Kunst*, 1920), Beyer (*Die Katakombenwelt*, 1927). Culture and education in Christian Antiquity have been treated by von Schubert (1925).

(To be continued.)

¹ *Die evangelische Theologie, 3te Theil: Die Kirchengeschichte*, 31-32 (1928).

Literature.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

THE Hulsean Lecture has been thrown open to scholars of communions other than the Church of England; and, aptly enough, the first of these to be invited was Dr. C. A. Anderson Scott, who was also the first of them to be given the D.D. by the University of Cambridge. That it was a wise choice all will heartily agree who read the scholarly and thought-provoking lectures in their printed form. Dr. Scott has boldly chosen to deal with what is moving more and more into the centre of the field. A few more books like his *New Testament Ethics* (Cambridge University Press; 5s. net), and the old and silly gibe at works on Christian ethics as unreadable, or out on the circumference of things, will die of ridicule. Short and professedly elementary though it is, this is so obviously first-hand work, based on such careful study of the sources, that it keeps flashing fresh suggestions on the mind. Three chapters on the Master's teaching, two upon Paul's ethical passages, and one other on the problems of to-day—that sounds quite usual and simple. Yet this is the liveliest of books. On every page it stops one, and demands attention. Christ is no legislator. What He gives us is a spirit. Indeed (falling back on the old distinction between *mandata* and *consilia*), there is only one 'commandment issued on His bare authority,' the law of love, and various applications of it. And even about taking all of these too literally our Lord Himself expressly warned us with an unusual note of sadness, not to say of sharpness, in His voice, as being nothing less than spiritual obtuseness. Of sin Christ may say little, but He has intensified its horror past all calculation. What He means by sin is an inquiry which leads Dr. Scott into some fascinating studies. Vindictiveness, he feels, seems to our Lord to be most fatal; and, in passing, he underlines how little Jesus is concerned about the man who needs forgiveness, how He concentrates upon the other and what will he make of it? Vindictiveness and possessiveness—*πλεονεξία*, which he translates insatiableness. Others are *ὑπερηφανία*, translated as despising others; *βλασφημία*, injurious speech, not so much against God, as men; *ἀφροσύνη*, moral insensibility; and hypocrisy, 'failure to think out the practical application of one's religious principles in one's relations with men.' Positively, there is little independent detail in Christ's picture of a good man. There are the

Beatitudes—the meek, for instance, 'those who make no claim, but cast themselves upon the mercy of God.' But two general maxims stand out clearly. 'Do not press for your rights,' and 'Do more than your duties, and do them in a different spirit.'

As to the Apostle, what strikes our author is how marvellously he did really have the mind of Christ even on such new and original things as our Lord's teaching upon sexual morality, or on His underlining of caring for others as the master-key to all the problems of social relationship and the like. Some bold pages argue that even on the Law, Master and pupil were at one; which may, perhaps, be conceded. But one is not a little staggered when, in dealing with the differences between Paul's mind and Christ's, it is emphatically argued that on Divine forgiveness Christ is forensic in a way that Paul is not, and that in some respects the Apostle 'apparently advances beyond the Master.' This simply cannot be proved, and the attempt to do so leaves one wholly unconvinced.

What kind of motives did Paul stress, and what standards did he set before his people, and how did he apply his Master's teaching to the circumstances that confronted him? Themes such as these bring us to the last chapter, on what we must do with Jesus' teaching that it may be vital and sufficient for the problems of our time. An interesting, fresh, impressive book.

THE PROBLEM OF PAIN.

To every generation, because ultimately to every human heart, the supreme enigma of undeserved suffering presents itself in some form or other. This it is which makes the Book of Job one of enthralling interest to the reflective mind. It contains within itself the challenge to belief in an all-wise God which adversity makes to the truly good man. This great drama presented by the ancient Hebrew author is dealt with in *The Problem of Pain*, by Professor J. E. McFadyen, D.D. (James Clarke; 6s. net), the third edition of which is just published.

Dr. McFadyen has, with admirable literary tact, set this old and moving story in a new light. Without entering into wearisome discussion concerning the form of 'Job,' he presents it to us as a drama complete with prologue, acts, and epilogue. The arrangement proves advantageous to the reader,

since alike on our minds and our hearts, the intellectual and spiritual impact of the whole through the increased clearness of the parts is greatly enhanced.

Moreover, all the implications of the characters are more easily grasped. Dr. McFadyen does not permit us to rest in the belief that Job's friends are merely repeating each other in their various statements of the traditional view of suffering as retributive. They, all four, hold this belief, yet, as Dr. McFadyen elicits for us all the nuances of character which lie behind their different expressions of it, our interest is caught and held by the power and truth of the exposition. We are made to feel, in the interplay of these individual minds with that of the hero, the real titanic quality of Job's spirit. As he combats their assertive complacency, his flaming wrath against it lifts his mind to the highest flights of power, so that even his daring scepticism assumes a grandeur that dwarfs all easy acceptance of authoritative orthodoxy. With unerring skill Dr. McFadyen has brought all this home to us.

As the author tells us, this discussion of 'Job' is not primarily critical, yet behind the flow of lucid explanation the discerning eye will see acuteness of critical acumen operating upon a thorough knowledge of this most difficult text and its many variant readings. The scholarship here is scholarship at its best—profound but restrained. Probably this is best seen in the translation of 'Job' which is woven into the commentary. We are grateful to Dr. McFadyen for giving us a metrical version which combines trustworthy renderings with true poetic diction. There are here displayed a keen sense of dramatic values, a just appreciation of literary motifs, a careful and sympathetic exegesis, and a taste in translation impeccable alike on the sides of truth and of culture.

The whole commentary manifests a sincere and notable comprehension of the hero's problem, and on the psychical side of that problem Dr. McFadyen gives both enlightenment to the mind and hope to the heart. Thoroughly modern in tone, eminently sane but not pedestrian in interpretation, popular in a wholly becoming sense of that term, *The Problem of Pain* will, we are sure, find in this new edition a warm welcome from many readers both new and old.

ISAIAH.

Professor J. B. Allan, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., was undoubtedly right in his *Isaiah*, chs. 1-39, *Translated*

into Colloquial English (National Adult School Union; 1s. net), when he determined to reproduce, so far as possible, something of the metrical lilt of the prophecy. This was not easy, but it was worth while, for the prophets were poets. He was also undoubtedly right in endeavouring 'to give an intelligible translation which is not a paraphrase.' A translator who aims at 'colloquial English' is almost irresistibly tempted to be paraphrastic; but a paraphrase, however valuable in its place, is not a translation. And Dr. Allan is to be congratulated not only on these high ideals of the translator's task, but on the success with which he has achieved them. The book abounds in passages of rhythmical and musical English. Here is one, which also illustrates the writer's close study of the text and his extensive knowledge of suggested emendations:

They've advanced through the heat of the south,
A land of stress and anxiety,
With lion and lioness roaring,
With vipers and snakes that have wings (30⁶).

Of the longer passages, chs. 34 and 35 are a severe test of a translator's skill and sensitiveness to words, and Dr. Allan comes out of the ordeal excellently.

It is the more to be regretted, when the general level is so high, that Dr. Allan descends at times to English which is very decidedly and even painfully colloquial. For example, 'I'm fed up with burnt-offerings of rams' (1¹¹); 'When His fist is up, who can pull it down?' (14²⁷); 'chummy with thieves' (1²³); 'even the fir-trees are chuckling over you' (14⁸); 'men who are fuddled with wine' (28¹); 'he that believes will not be let down' (28¹⁶); 'does the axe cheek up to the chopper?' (10¹⁵). Short of this slang, there are expressions which are too prosy: for example, 'trampling my courts is a thing you must stop . . . new moons and sabbaths I simply can't stand' (1¹²). The difficulty of reproducing word-plays is notorious: the famous utterance in 7⁹, which crystallizes Isaiah's gospel, appears thus, 'If you don't believe, you won't be alive.' Dr. Allan would probably defend the translations to which we have taken exception on the principle that 'alliteration, onomatopoeia, acrostics and conundrums, startling and unexpected epigrams, refrains, witticisms, hyperboles, slang, and more, are everywhere.' Slang? But admittedly Isaiah's regal soul was matched by his regal style, and slang is the last thing one would look for in the poetry of one whose eyes had seen the King.

Nevertheless this is an excellent book. The chronological arrangement and the separation of the individual oracles will be of much value to the

readers for whom the volume is intended, and the introductions, which are brief, are a really illuminating guide to the oracles which follow. Indeed, the book is so good, and so uniformly good, that it might have been better; and it may still be better if, in the second edition, which will soon be called for, the slang is replaced by language more consonant with the dignity of the prophet, who was a prince among stylists.

HANS DRIESCH.

Hans Driesch is, of course, a figure to be reckoned with, and it is well that his *Ethical Principles* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) has been translated. It is an extraordinarily lucid book (for which part of the credit, doubtless, rests with Mr. W. H. Johnston, the translator), dealing not much with abstract theory, but rather with the liveliest, not to say the liveliest, of subjects: Peace,—to the author *the* essential question of our day,—and War, and Pacifism, and Nationalism (a poor shabby business), and Patriotism good and bad, and the State, and Education, Marriage, Birth Control, and so on. Quite obviously we are here in a real world of palpable and solid things and very thorny problems. Yet Dr. Driesch never so much as hesitates, is calm, confident, self-assured, dogmatic upon every question as it rises. There is a phrase which at one portion of the book recurs almost with the insistence of a chorus—‘this is a dualistic world.’ Yet to this thinker life seems curiously simple at the core. A hearer of his once asserted that Dr. Denney’s dogmatism in the pulpit had awakened more doubts in his mind than had anything else. ‘For,’ said he, ‘he is so very certain that he forces me to think, “But there must be another side.”’ Few books for many a day have called out more hesitating question marks upon the margin from one reader than has this one. But it is a fine discipline to read this fruit of a convinced and vital mind. In any case our author warns us that at his age he feels he has some right to speak on ethics, since he has lived through those human situations which form its subject; and, even more, because he is convinced that, beyond questions of mere meaning, ethics is a confession and nothing more. He seems to fear that the world does not love confessions—a questionable verdict. Some, without a doubt, will turn aside to this one.

THE PATHETIC FALLACY.

The Pathetic Fallacy (Longmans; 5s. net), a booklet of less than one hundred and thirty pages,

is a slight and superficial thing of no importance. But as a man with a virulent antipathy to something, who shouts his hate of it aloud at a street corner, is fairly certain of an audience of sorts, so Mr. Llewelyn Powys may gather quite a knot about him for a time. For he too is a good hater, and he has a loud and carrying voice. His particular antipathy is Christianity. Not that he knows much about it, or has begun to understand it. Indeed, the main impression left upon the reader is that not often can a less religious mind have had the hardihood to write about religion. Once on a day an English farmer expressed to the present writer a lofty contempt for literature. ‘This ’ere Shakespeare now,’ said he, ‘of what use is he anyway? That muck now *is* of use, but——’ and he waved the poet out of court.

But it is curious to see a bucolic mind of much the same type in essentials putting its curiously crude thoughts into print, and obviously spending time on it. For Mr. Powys is very nearly a distinguished writer. There are pages that reveal real sensitiveness in his finger-tips for the right word; though, unfortunately, there are others that fall curiously far below his own high standard. None the less he can write. But the thinking just won’t do. For some natures the sinister office of *advocatus diaboli* must have been a sheer joy. Mr. Powys is of the number. He takes this thing, Christianity, with its astonishing record of gallantry and self-sacrifice, this thing which beyond question has been the inspiration and the power of lives innumerable, and, passing all that by, he gloats over the shadows in the story and fastens thirstily on any sore. The whole chapter on the beyond, for example, consists of three lurid quotations—the over-worked passage from poor old Tertullian, that of course; and one from Aquinas, and one from Father Furness. And that is all. And this is headed Christian conceptions. To him this whole business for which Christianity stands is just a dream, and we have awakened, and it must go, is going, indeed has almost gone, says he, adding ‘Thank God,’ if indeed there is a God to thank. One has heard that many times before, and often put with vastly greater point and power than here, and still the faith survives. ‘If,’ said old John Newton, ‘you think you see the ark of God toppling, you can be absolutely certain that that is due to a swimming in your own head.’

The publishers, boosting their wares, put on the cover, ‘It is a simple matter to say that the basis of Christianity is so unreasonable that it could not be accepted by any intelligent person of modern

ideas, but it is another thing altogether to set down arguments which that modern intelligent person will find convincing.'—'For this opinion he here sets down his reasons. Are they convincing?'

It is difficult to believe that any human being can ask that question with sincerity, so trivial is the argument. But what jars one is the so-called tribute to Jesus Christ. 'No homage could be great enough with which to honour Him.' One wonders, on the author's showing of things, why. Certainly it is when speaking of Christ that he writes his best, and is himself most stirred. Much in Christ thrills him. 'There was that in Him that could not be contaminated.' 'A mean soul He could smell from afar off like a bad fish.' 'No man has been less blinkered than Jesus, less spiritually blindfold.' And yet 'the intellect can get no coherent sense out of these pages.' 'He said many ignorant and foolish things.' 'The mind of Jesus was full of misconceptions: life is not ordered by a loving father. A sucking child can see that it is not.' Multitudes have found it necessary to give Christ a homage far greater than that, and even dare to question if Mr. Llewelyn Powys is big enough to talk down to Him in this complacent fashion. As for Paul—on 1 Co 13 there is this: 'It was as though a toad sitting under a burdock leaf had suddenly opened its wide gaping mouth, and lo, because there was love in its heart, had been able to give utterance to a music more beautiful than the singing of any hermit thrush.' And Calvin: 'One crazy thought follows another in dreary sequence.' And so on. Mr. Powys thinks that all philosophies and all religions and all moralities have sprung from fear of death. 'As toadstools grow up from buried logs, so do these fantasies take their nourishment from buried bones.' We spin vain dreams to keep ourselves brave. But they are only dreams. Science I know, and Freud I know, he says. But, turning to Christianity, what is this? It is something big enough to look down with a kindly humour on this little man who hopes to scream it out of the hearts innumerable in which it has proved itself.

THE EVOLUTIONARY PROCESS.

Spirit in Evolution, by Mr. Herbert F. Standing, D.Sc. (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), sufficiently declares its purpose by its title. The writer defines the central thesis of his book as being 'that the whole evolutionary process is fundamentally a manifestation of divine purpose and activity, and that man's spiritual experiences, involving the

realization of his highest ideals of Beauty, Truth, Goodness, and Love, are in line with the upward trend of Organic Evolution, and alone give an intelligible meaning to the whole World-process.' In elucidating and defending this thesis he undertakes a rapid but comprehensive survey of the main factors which have dominated the evolutionary process. These are arranged under six principal heads, namely, Response to Environment, Nutrition, Unification, Race Preservation, Sublimation of Mental Processes, and Evolution of Values. In his treatment the writer makes liberal use of illustrative examples drawn from the writings of leading biologists, but he maintains his independence of mind throughout by the skilful use he makes of them in supporting his main thesis. His argument generally is in favour of an emergent evolution with God acknowledged as 'the Fundamental Directive Activity.' 'From the purely scientific point of view we may think of the various "emergent" qualities which successively make their appearance as the "outspringing of something which has hitherto not been in being." This does not prevent our holding the philosophic position that this same evolutionary advance is a progressive manifestation of the Creative Activity of God. . . . This immanent activity which is the ultimate source of the phenomena which we seek to explain in the process of evolution culminates for the religious consciousness in the intuitive enjoyment of the Divine Activity within us. Not only is it true that in Him we live and move and have our being, but the human consciousness also testifies to the influx of divine energy which dominates, transforms, and utilises the human personality, bringing it into line with those moral and spiritual forces in harmony with which the highest evolutionary process is alone possible.' The book is not too technical for the general reader, to whom it is fitted to give a very sane and well-reasoned view of the evolutionary process as leading upward towards ideal human personality.

THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Some years ago Dr. Alexander Nairne, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, wrote a book entitled 'Every Man's Story of the Old Testament' which has commanded a very large sale. A companion volume, *Every Man's Story of the New Testament* (Mowbray; quarter-canvas 4s. 6d. net, cloth 6s. net), has now appeared, also likely to be widely read, though its appeal is not so much, like

that of the former book, to Every Man in general as to Every Man who takes a serious and thoughtful interest in the Bible. The volume is furnished with several maps and embellished with a great number of illustrations. The style is nervous and vivid, and the pages are enriched with many an instance drawn from literature and history. Altogether an admirable *vade mecum* for the general student of the New Testament.

What is it that we find in this book? Not an outline of the modern criticism of the New Testament, though the author is never unmindful of critical positions. Rather is it an endeavour to follow the story of the New Testament as a movement, and to trace the growth of its inner significance. 'The course of the Gospel is like a river. The source is fed by manifold influences, from far and near, hidden or visible. From the source the stream springs among the hills. There it runs purely and delightfully. Thence through a chasm it falls in cataract; and sweeps on as a river, enlarged and deepened by tributaries, fertilising wide lands. Then dissipated, retarded, strained to rarer purity in the sands, it debouches at last into the sea.' The gospel stream and spring in Galilee, the cataract of Calvary, the swelling of the Galilean stream into a river fertilizing Syria and Europe, then a period of retardation, and then the issuing of the gospel upon its world-wide, pervasive destiny—all this is depicted in these pages, in both its outward and its inward aspect, with masterly skill, with originality and freshness, and from a standpoint at once modern and evangelical. The perusal of such a book could not fail to illuminate for Every Man the whole literature of the New Testament, and might well lead him to consult some of the further 'aids to study' mentioned by Dr. Nairne in his discriminating and liberal-minded penultimate chapter.

METHODISM AND INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION.

In *The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution* (Longmans; 15s. net) Mr. Wellman J. Warner, Ph.D., has written a very able and well-documented work, based on a thorough study of the contemporary authorities. The plan of the book is simple. Against the background of a discussion of the emergence of the individual in the eighteenth century, Dr. Warner explores the Methodist contribution to the political liberalism, the economic life, and the philanthropic enterprise of the period. He finds the basis of Wesleyan social ethics in the

doctrines of the diseased will and perfectionism, and treats these doctrines with an insight not always manifest in students of social progress. Dr. Warner argues that in its political trends the Methodist social theory embodied conflicting tendencies, since its main thesis, that the full play of the moralized will can solve all social problems, was 'curiously yoked with an idea of providence' which, after Wesley's death, was used to justify the existing status, and fostered a definitely conservative spirit. In the sphere of economic ideals the Methodists displayed a healthy enthusiasm: industriousness was exalted as a duty, a high standard of economic morality was required, and the man of property was taught that he was but a steward of God, 'the sole proprietor of all things.' In the third stage of his investigation Dr. Warner fully illustrates the Methodist record of philanthropy, but finds the failure of the movement in 'its inability to translate this habitual mood into anything more than personal and ameliorative activity.'

In sum, Dr. Warner's evaluation of Methodism in the industrial revolution is that of a noble and effective movement which 'missed its opportunity.' The measure of truth in this indictment cannot be denied, but, on the other hand, Dr. Warner does no sort of justice to the immense service of Methodism in counteracting destructive social forces, a feature which has deeply impressed M. Halévy and other students of the period, and he makes no reference to the passion for social righteousness characteristic of the Primitive Methodists. These omissions only stimulate our desire that Dr. Warner may pursue his investigations further into the social aspects of the Methodist movement, for over the ground covered he has shown himself a highly competent and well-informed guide.

The one hundred and sixteenth volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* has now been issued (Christian World; 7s. 6d. net). It contains the weekly parts which appeared between July and December 1929. The bulk of the volume contains sermons which have been reported almost verbatim, but in addition to this there are some outlines given. The work of the best preachers is represented, and it is obvious from this collection that there is no falling off in the standard of preaching in this country. One of the sermons given in 'The Christian Year' last month appeared in this volume.

In *The Priest in the Church* (James Clarke; 5s.

net), the Rev. J. Edward Flower, M.A., narrates the progress of those doctrines and practices in the Anglican Church which constitute a breach with Protestantism, and in his view fully justified the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book by Parliament. The author is very frank and quite uncompromising in his robust Protestantism. We regret the subtitle of the book—'an unexplored page in English ecclesiastical history.' The book breaks no new ground.

In *The Slavonic Josephus and its Relation to Josippon and Hegesippus* (Dropsie College, Philadelphia), Professor Solomon Zeitlin returns to the question of the Christ Passage in Josephus, with which he had dealt in an earlier brochure, and answers the criticism of Dr. Eisler, who had accused him of ignoring a Christian passage found in Josippon. Zeitlin argues that in the original Josippon, which he assigns to the fifth century, there was no story about Jesus. The Latin Hegesippus, which is a free translation from the Greek Josephus compiled during the fourth century, is full of Christian interpolations. Zeitlin's conclusion is that not only were there no Christian passages in Josippon, but that there was none in Josephus; that 'the passage which we now find in the "Antiquities" was not from the hand of Josephus, but was interpolated by Eusebius.' He seems to demolish effectually Eisler's hypothesis that the Slavonic Josephus is based on a book by Josephus on the capture of Jerusalem which gave an account of Jesus and His Apostles. 'There never was such a book.' Zeitlin argues that the Slavonic Josephus is in reality a translation from a *Byzantine* Greek version of the accepted Josephus, by a writer acquainted with the Apocryphal Gospels and the Church Fathers.

The Rev. Roderick Dunkerley has reprinted his article on *The Oxyrhynchus Gospel Fragments* that appeared in the 'Harvard Theological Review' in January of this year. Copies (1s. post free) may be had from him; his address is 10 Brunswick Square, Gloucester, England. The Fragments he deals with are Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1, 654, 655, 840, and 1224. The first two of these, the so-called 'Sayings of Jesus' and 'New Sayings of Jesus,' gave rise to considerable discussion. The two most recent theories as to their origin are those of Evelyn White, who traces them to the (Aramaic) Gospel according to the Hebrews, and Vernon Bartlet, who traces them to the Alexandrine Gospel of the Twelve or Greek Gospel according

to the Hebrews. The author of the article hesitates over both theories; indeed, he is of opinion that the two Fragments may not be from the same work. The first is probably part of a genuine Treasury of Sayings gathered from the Canonical Gospels and elsewhere, and the second part of a secondary Gospel.

The Rev. Vincent Taylor, Ph.D., D.D., already well known for his contributions in the field of New Testament criticism, has followed these up with an Introduction to the four Gospels, a remarkably clear and compendious exposition on which he is to be congratulated. The work is entitled *The Gospels: A Short Introduction* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), and treats questions of sources, date, and authorship, and the mutual relations of one Gospel to another. It is a book which should be welcomed by the beginner in such studies, and the more advanced student would find it very convenient for reference. The expositions and discussions are couched in a restrained and judicious style, and bear the hall-mark of competence. That the work is fresh and up to date may be gathered from the fact that it offers guidance to the reader on such matters as the 'form-historical method,' the proto-Luke hypothesis, and the Mandæan parallels in the Fourth Gospel. It is a timely remark that 'form-criticism is a significant protest against the tyranny of source-criticism.'

The Free Spirit, by Mr. Carl Heath (Friends' Book Centre; 3s.), is a plea for the application to religion of the experimental method which is universally employed to-day by investigators into every other aspect of reality. Any creed worth having must issue from experience. Mr. Heath also argues earnestly against the Dualism which would set the God of Nature as a non-moral Being against the moral Being who is our Heavenly Father. There cannot be two centres of being, each in radical conflict with the other; besides, man is included within Nature. From this point of view he criticises Barth. While fully appreciating the tremendous power and influence of that teacher's message, he finds in the radical separation between the natural and the spiritual the destruction of any really integral conception of life. One of the best chapters is on the Mystery of Grace, in which he joins issue with the common view that grace is the merely arbitrary favour of an awful God, and argues that 'this grace is poured out on all men; beauty and truth and goodness are alike for the just and the unjust, the saint and the

sinner, the Christian and the non-Christian alike.' The writer also takes occasion to prove that the Quaker is as appreciative of the community idea as of the inner light. Athanasias appears twice on p. 36. Altogether a little book full of generous and stimulating thought.

This year's *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, No. xv. (Manchester University Press), contains, among other interesting items, a chapter on Recent Excavations (Egyptian) by Miss W. M. Crompton, the secretary, and one on 'The Life-giving Pearl,' by Professor Maurice A. Canney, as well as an excellent appreciation of Professor A. S. Peake and other vice-presidents who have passed away. The Society, which has over seventy members, deals with questions regarding the languages, literatures, and history of Egypt and the Orient, and also helps excavating societies in their work. The Journal is worthy of study by all who look for accurate historical thinking about the East.

Dr. Harold Paul Sloan, of the Haddonfield Methodist Episcopal Church, New Jersey, has written a new work entitled *The Apostles' Creed* (Methodist Book Concern, New York; \$1.50). In the Introduction it is justly claimed for the writer that 'about the successive tenets he has built a continuous discourse of exposition and instruction.' For he goes through the various clauses of the Creed in turn, expounds them sympathetically from a conservative standpoint, and applies their teaching in the evangelical spirit and with evangelical fervour to the lives of his hearers (who appear to have been the young people of his congregation). His book embodies a good deal of his personal experience, and is full of illustrative instances and references. The style is graphic, and at times unduly rhetorical; enthusiastic, and at times betrays a facile optimism. We have no doubt that these addresses have served to build up Dr. Sloan's congregation in the Christian faith, and we regard them as worthy of publication.

In a pamphlet, *What is the Meaning of the Parable of the Dishonest Steward?*, the Rev. W. R. G. Moir (Ardmore, Kinnear Road, Edinburgh; 4d.) offers, humbly and yet with confidence, an interpretation all his own of the much-disputed passage, Lk 16¹⁻¹³. He contends, in full view of the original text and of the commentaries, that the message of the Parable is to the Twelve, the other disciples, and the Pharisees and scribes; and its burden is that on

our use of God's riches to save sinners our own salvation depends.

Pro Fide (Murray; 12s. net), by the Rev. Charles Harris, D.D., Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral, has proved a useful manual of Apologetics. First published in 1905, it is now in its fourth edition. The third edition contained a supplementary chapter in defence of the Chalcedonian orthodoxy; the fourth edition also contains a supplementary chapter, which we notice in another column, in which guidance is offered to the Christian apologist on recent tendencies of thought. The theological standpoint of the author, negatively described, is anti-modernist; positively described, it is liberal-orthodox. The range of the work is very comprehensive. The book begins with an exposition and defence of theism, and then passes to such general theological or philosophical doctrines as those of creation, freedom, and immortality, finally considering more specific points of Christian apology such as the person of Jesus and His miracles and resurrection. The bibliographies are up to date.

To the 'Every Teacher's Library' Series, the Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L., has contributed a useful volume on *The Later Story of the Hebrews*, practically the three centuries that separate Amos from Malachi (National Sunday School Union; 2s. 6d. net). The story, which is told in refreshingly simple language and in a thoroughly interesting way, wisely weaves material from the prophetic books into the historical narrative, with the result that the reader, besides winning a clear impression of the sequence of events, is also confronted at every turn with the great figures and messages of the prophets. This is all to the good. A valuable feature of the narrative is that it is enlivened by analogies drawn from modern history. Cyrus' toleration for foreign religions, for example, recalls 'the custom of our kings, who are Anglicans when in England and Presbyterians when in Scotland.' Again, the difficulties of the Jewish settlers on their return from Babylon are compared by Dr. Gillie to the difficulties that attended the settlement of New England in the early part of the seventeenth century. The present uncertainties that beset Old Testament criticism are illustrated by the statement that no result is more certain than that Is 40-55 was 'sent forth when Cyrus' prospective triumph was imminent,' but Professor Torrey has recently argued elaborately against this view. Privelege (p. 116) should be corrected, and on p. 46 Is xxviii. should be xxvii. The book,

which vividly describes a significant period of history, may be heartily commended to teachers and pupils alike.

The Rev. Basil Mathews has added a third (and last) volume to his two former on *Jesus and Youth: A World-Study of Jesus Christ* (Pilgrim Press; 2s. 6d. net). This volume contains lesson-outlines for young adolescents, with subjects for discussion and daily Bible readings. It takes us to the end of the ministry of Jesus in the gospel narrative. Every one of the 'studies' is done on the same lines. The story is told, with lively and suitable explanations and interpolations, so that the telling raises many vital questions as it goes along. Then the definite subjects for discussion are mentioned, and finally a series of Bible readings for the week, leading up to the lesson. It is all very well done, and we cordially commend the three volumes to those who have classes of young adolescents to teach. They could not get better guidance or a better guide.

The Scientific Background of the Christian Creeds (Andrew Reid & Co., Newcastle; 2s. net) is a booklet composed of two Riddell Memorial Lectures recently delivered before the University of Durham by Professor W. M. Thornton, O.B.E., D.Sc., D.Eng., of the Chair of Electrical Engineering. The first lecture is entitled 'The Doctrine of the Trinity and the Kenosis Theory'; the second, 'The Consequent Clauses of the Creeds.' The lectures are remarkable as apparently combining loyalty to the Catholic Creeds with a fresh scientific outlook upon the universe. Though the lecturer is convinced that to approach religion through science alone is impossible, he finds in recent scientific theory a true point of contact with religious belief. It appears to him that 'science by its discovery that the universe is finite, and that matter and energy are interchangeable, has placed in our hands a key to one of the mysteries of creation, the manner in which it was done and the vast extent of the effort.' Nor is he content to establish scientific contact with the general religious doctrine of creation. As the following quotation shows, he seeks to press scientific principles into the very heart of Christian doctrine itself: 'the visible material universe is the Kenosis of God the Father in the same sense that we may regard the Incarnation and self-surrender of Christ as the Kenosis of the Son.'

It is some time since we drew attention to the

very cheap sermon series which is being published by Messrs. Stockwell under the title of 'The People's Pulpit.' The latest—and this is an excellent volume—is *Comprehensive Religion*, by the Hon. and Rev. James Adderley (2s. 6d. net). It was from this volume that we gave some extracts in 'The Christian Year' last month. Mr. Adderley explains why he has called the volume *Comprehensive Religion*. It is because in it he has tried to keep in mind points upon which all Christians do, or ought to, agree. 'I am convinced that it is only as a Comprehensive Church that we Anglicans can justify our position in Christendom. I do not apologise for the title. Rather, I believe that God has called us to make what may seem a new experiment in religion. At any rate, if Comprehensiveness is right, it is the Church of England that has the best opportunity of realising it.'

Other volumes in this series are:—*The Unending Benediction*, by the Rev. J. Emrys Morgan, B.D.; *The Seven Words from the Cross*, by the Rev. E. P. Dickie, B.D.; *Is there a Future for Calvinism?* by the Rev. H. Tydeman Chilvers; *Paul and the Prodigal Son*, by the Rev. J. E. Rattenbury, D.D.; *Life's Unknown Demands*, by the Rev. Campbell Taylor, M.A.; *The Discovery of God*, by the Rev. Joseph Johnston, M.A.; *Human Relationships*, by the Rev. Godwin Birchenough, M.A.; 'Thorough,' by the Rev. H. Bowden-Smith, M.A.; *Members of the Kingdom*, by the Rev. J. W. Augur, M.A.; *Nazareth Politics*, by the Rev. P. T. R. Kirk, M.A.; *The Centre of the Road*, by the Rev. W. Cocks, A.K.C.; *Within the Veil*, by the Rev. Oswald Harvey, M.A.; *Life in Christ*, by the Rev. B. Scott Williams, B.D.; *Jesus and the Art of Living*, by the Rev. A. Herbert Gray, D.D.

The Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. A. C. Headlam, will always be listened to with respect, because he is a scholar of recognized eminence, because he is sincere, and because he is moderate and broad-minded, while perfectly loyal to his own convictions. These are great qualities, and they are all evident in a book which he has just published, *Christian Unity* (S.C.M.; 4s. net). Every Anglican writer at present seems to be discussing the same topic. Books on it rain from the press week by week. But few of them are more rewarding than this one. It contains the substance of four lectures delivered at Oxford and at King's College, London. The topics are The Need of Unity, The Unity of the Faith, The Church, The Sacrament, The Ministry, and The South Indian Scheme. Dr. Headlam shirks none

of the difficulties, but he finds none of them too great to be surmounted by charity and knowledge. The book will be anathema to extremists, for Dr. Headlam frankly confesses that there is no ground in Scripture that can be pleaded either by Episcopalians or Presbyterians as Divine warrant for their systems. He finds no insuperable barrier to reunion in the doctrine either of the ministry or the Sacraments, and he gives his blessing to the South India Scheme. Whatever school the reader belongs to, he ought to read this book. Its spirit, if nothing else, will do him good. It is an eirenicon in the best Christian sense.

The great 'human needs,' says Bishop Francis John McConnell, are Better Health, More Wealth, Sounder Knowledge, Larger Freedom, Closer Fellowship, and the Vision of God. He says this at great length and with ample illustration in his book *Human Needs and World Christianity* (S.C.M. ; 5s. net). As the title suggests, Dr. McConnell thinks that Christianity should help in meeting these needs. But it is *world* Christianity, not ours or yours, and especially not western Christianity alone. He has much to say of the superiority complex with which we approach non-Christian peoples, and he finds much to blame in this. 'We need for the total vision of God the contribution of all peoples,' he writes. We are to co-operate with non-Christian people. The uniqueness of Christianity is its unique power to use everything that is usable. This is one of the points in Dr. McConnell's able book. The other is that evangelization of the world does not only mean carry-

ing the 'gospel,' but meeting the great human needs. The book is well written, and never dull. It is full of a noble passion for a real, world-wide, and penetrating influence of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Anything done to promote systematic and intelligent Bible reading must be highly serviceable to the Church and the individual Christian life. *Jesus among Men*, by H. T. Hodgkin, M.A., M.B. (S.C.M. ; 4s. net), aims at rendering this service. It contains a series of readings from the Gospels covering a period of twelve weeks. The readings of each week are devoted to one topic, such as Jesus and the Common Man, Jesus and the Home, Jesus and Women, etc. Each day's reading is elucidated by a brief and pointed commentary, while each week's topic is summed up in a review. The whole work is done with insight and care, and the writer's hope is 'that the book may prove valuable in promoting and revitalising the practice of family worship.'

Interest in the Eastern Church is deepening in the West, and sources of accurate information are accumulating. We cordially recommend a small book which we have read with great pleasure—*The Church of the Greek People Past and Present*, by Miss Euphrosyne Kephala (Williams & Norgate ; 5s. net). It gives an interesting, informative, and succinct account of the history of the Church in Greece since Greek independence was achieved, its constitution, sacraments, doctrines, ritual, clergy, and spirit. Its accuracy is guaranteed by a Foreword by the Archbishop of Thyatira.

Theology in Relation to Preaching.

BY THE REVEREND H. J. LEWIS, TUNSTALL, STOKE-ON-TRENT.

Is preaching to-day less theological than formerly ? This question no doubt often presents itself to the church-goer, if in his reading he strolls through the fields, or ought we to say over the highlands, of sermonic literature produced by generations now gone. We are fond of making comparisons, and no doubt preachers of to-day congratulate themselves that they are not expected to discourse for long periods on such subjects as 'Predestination,' 'Eternal Punishment,' or 'Christ's Body not in the Eucharist'—a theme which John Wycliffe

chose upon one occasion. These subjects are taboo to the average congregation, and often to the preacher himself. We hear enough about 'dry' sermons, though it should be remembered that the criticism that a sermon is 'dry' depends for its validity as much upon the mentality of the listener as upon the subject-matter of the discourse. We have discovered that the sermon which would have delighted an audience when preached by John Wesley would be much less attractive to the average congregation to-day. This does not mean that

the subjects chosen by the founder of Methodism had in themselves no permanent value, it merely indicates that the thought of the age is along other lines and chooses to express itself in other ways. The extent to which the 'pew' governs the utterance of the 'pulpit' would form the theme of a very interesting discussion. We are not concerned with that just now; we simply note the fact that the old type of theological discourse seems to have passed.

It must be admitted that the language of the pulpit has changed. One-time familiar words such as 'Atonement,' 'Justification,' 'Sanctification,' 'Regeneration,' are gradually slipping from the vocabulary of religious speech. This is reflected also in the hymns chosen for congregational worship. We would not imply that the great doctrines of our Christian faith are treated as of less importance than formerly. We simply call attention to a general tendency, to which, no doubt, there are numerous exceptions, yet which must be very noticeable to older people of the present day.

Again, with regard to the training of the preacher, both ministerial and lay, changes in relation to the study of theology are observed. The old compendium of theology has largely fallen into disuse. Handbooks such as that of Dr. J. S. Banks, or the larger work of Dr. W. B. Pope, now rest in dusty retirement upon the shelves. Sometimes the demand is made for a text-book of theology which will cover the whole ground of Christian doctrine, though such a demand, if met, could only partially suffice. Theological books are written by the score, but they differ in style and treatment from those of the past very considerably: The *Outline of Christian Theology*, by Dr. W. Newton Clarke, is now many years old. Others have been written since, but this book marked a new era in theological statement. It was written in the light of much new learning, and took account of matters which Dr. Banks and Dr. Pope did not consider. It marked an expansion of the theological views, and yet Dr. W. Newton Clarke modestly calls his work of nearly five hundred pages an 'Outline.' In the light of subsequent events it is no doubt too much to expect any one to produce a text-book which would give a complete statement of theological belief. If the world has grown smaller by virtue of easy facilities for communication, the thought of man has widened as the result of research and discovery. This widening of thought has proved to be a matter of vital importance to religion, and hence to theology. Theology is no longer limited to the textual substance of the Old and New Testaments. It is

now a science of many branches. The tree has grown and is still growing. Little surprise need be felt that the plan of studies of local preachers, college students, and probationary ministers provides for theological study by means of specialization in particular subjects, rather than by the study of a handbook, however well written, which attempts to cover the whole ground of religious thought.

According to its etymological meaning, the word 'theology' denotes discourse or doctrine concerning God. In this sense it was used among the Greeks to describe the work of poets like Homer and Hesiod when they wrote of the gods and their doings. It was also applied to the speculative philosophy of Plato and Aristotle when they argued concerning the supreme reality or ultimate ground of all things. In early Christian literature the word 'theologian' was applied to orthodox Greek Fathers, like Athanasius and others who distinguished themselves in defending the Personality and Divinity of the λόγος. Theology in earliest times was limited to doctrine concerning God—His being and attributes. But to-day it has a much wider meaning. Man's knowledge of God is part of the content of that in experience which we call religion. Now religion takes account of the world of Nature and of man; of sin and of death; of salvation and of immortal life. Hence in these days we find the phrase 'science of religion' substituted for the older word 'theology.' The suggestion is made that what was once the most important branch of human knowledge is now only one department of scientific investigation. Scientific method is pressed into the service of religious inquiry with the idea of eliminating uncertainty and establishing religious truth upon a foundation that cannot be shaken.

In the day when the distinctively 'theological' sermon was preached, theology was the chief of sciences. Some of our modern and very important sciences were unknown in the developed form in which we know them. Much of the material with which they deal was available, but men did not think it worth while to specialize to the same extent as we do to-day; which no doubt partially accounts for the different type of sermon of the present time. We find, therefore, that while theology is looked upon as one amongst other branches of scientific investigation, and in a measure has lost the prominent position it once held, in itself it is a much bigger thing than in the past. The widening of the sphere of knowledge generally has greatly extended the scope of theological study, with the result that things which once were unassociated with it, are now included. Theology having adopted the

scientific method characteristic of other branches of knowledge, has been brought to a truer sense of its own value in relation to life as a whole.

The result is, that theology is less dogmatic than was once the case. This does not mean that the truths with which it deals are less real or less important. It means rather, that, before expressing ourselves with an air of infallibility, we keep an open mind until all the factors which might have a bearing upon our subject have been investigated. Perhaps we shall never see a return to the dogmatism of former generations, because knowledge from unanticipated sources comes upon us like a flood so that we are reluctant to express ourselves. Indeed, where former generations were certain beyond the point of contradiction, we hesitate. To some minds this lack of certainty is a distinct weakness and the pulpit is blamed for its indefiniteness. Along some lines the complaint seems to be justified, but in reality it should be interpreted as a compliment. We are bound at times to be less definite than formerly, but that is because we recognize that religious knowledge is not a closed system. The last fifty years have revolutionized discovery, not only in non-theological matters but especially in relation to the chief sources from which theological material is obtained. The Bible is a different book to us from what it was to Archbishop Cranmer, or even John Wesley, and it is because many do not recognize the sweeping changes that have taken place along that line alone that they marvel at the lack of dogmatic utterance from the pulpit to-day.

The conception which some have of the task of theology, is that it should set forth in a coherent, systematic form the content of that revelation concerning God, the world, and man of which the Bible is the inspired record. But while this is undoubtedly a very important department of theology, such a conception limits too much its scope and function. There are other materials and data for theological construction besides those furnished by the Bible which cannot be ignored by the scientific theologian. The natural world, together with our knowledge of the course of history, afford data of experience which are invaluable in building up a coherent system of theological belief. To this should be added the study of the moral consciousness of mankind generally. This general revelation in Nature, history, and conscience may be, however, and often is, treated as part of a scheme the chief factor in which is the historic revelation given through the religious experience of Israel and culminating in Jesus Christ.

Admitting, then, the extensiveness of the field covered by theological inquiry, we proceed to outline its dimensions. Thinking of theology as the 'science of religion,' we shall observe at once how vast a thing it is. We may divide it roughly into two main sections, each of which is capable of subdivision. Theology is related to the past and the present so that it has an historical content as well as a constructive. Historical theology must be held to cover non-Christian as well as Christian religious experience; for if theology is thought of as the 'science of religion,' we cannot limit our study to one form of religious expression more than another. Here we find ourselves taking up a position which the theology of the past very largely avoided. We no longer look upon non-Christian religions as wholly pernicious and devoid of any real value. Indeed, we recognize them to be the outcome of the soul's upward struggle under a variety of conditions of culture and environment, and, that being so, they have a real value for our purpose. We are just as justified in bringing these in review as we are the Hebrew faith. As an example of the adoption of this method we would call attention to Professor A. C. Underwood's volume, *Conversion, Christian and Non-Christian*. The study of non-Christian religions along the line of their origin, development, and relation to each other, to say nothing of their psychological value, cannot be rightly excluded from the sphere of scientific religious study. Such study will be largely historical.

With regard to the Christian religion in particular, we shall find that this historical aspect of theological study is very important, and may be summed up under the general term 'Biblical science.' The place of the Bible in the Christian religion needs no emphasis here. Already it has been pointed out that our ideas regarding its value and nature have undergone a great change in the last half-century, a change which is responsible very largely for the difference in form and content of modern preaching compared with a century ago. Biblical science forms no small part to-day of theological study, and has been chiefly responsible for a type of preaching which has appeared to be destructive rather than constructive. The criticism that Biblical science seeks to break down rather than to build up is superficial. It is only destructive in so far as it seeks to remove misconceptions and wrong interpretations. Its real purpose is definitely constructive. It is not unlikely that we have now reached a point where our knowledge of the Bible has taken a form more or less permanent,

only subject to minor modifications in the future. But whatever the future may hold, the Bible is now a far more effective instrument for righteousness than ever before, and is certainly capable of demonstrating the working out of God's purposes in human life in a way that is in harmony with our knowledge of His operations in other spheres.

What is called 'Biblical science' in its historical content includes many things. It deals amongst other things with the study of the original languages of the Bible and the interpretation and exposition of the actual text of Scripture. Allied to this is the investigation of the Biblical documents in relation to their date, authorship, and historical setting. Inquiry into the evolution of the ideas of God, man, society, and immortality in Hebrew literature is a very important branch of theology. The origin of the Christian Church, its early constitution and thought, forms part of this science, to say nothing of the history of doctrine and the use of symbols, creeds, and confessions. So that if we were simply to limit our conception of theology to its historical content we should find it by no means a simple thing. No one who would be a faithful preacher can ignore these things. We may not become experts in all of them, but we must take account of them, for they have a rightful place in our theological scheme.

But there is that other great division—the constructive. The use of this term by no means implies that the historical study to which we have referred is specially destructive. It is so called because it includes those sciences which deal with religion as a present-day reality and power, claiming to be truth by which the practical life of man should be moulded and regulated. Like the historical, this constructive inquiry may be pursued along two lines—general and special—the former dealing with the presentation, defence, and application of the truths of religion in general, and the latter with Christianity in particular as the highest and ultimate form of religion. Under the general study of practical religion comes the question of the inherent nature of religious experience and belief, and its truth as against Atheism, Materialism, Agnosticism, and other forms of unbelief. Likewise, the rational proofs for the existence of God and the various ways in which the human mind rises to the apprehension of supreme personal spirit as the ultimate reality, come within the scope of general constructive study. These are all theological studies, and of no mean importance.

Perhaps it is the special branch of constructive theology with which we are most familiar, for it

seems to provide that practical material which we feel to be of the greatest service to us as preachers. We are distinctly preachers of Christianity, and undoubtedly we are convinced that such is the highest form of religion and the surest way of salvation for the soul. We shall seek to preach Christ and Him crucified, but, well-intentioned as we may be, we shall find that we cannot isolate Christ from life either historical or present, and the lines of theological thought which have already been outlined all have a bearing upon our presentation of His gospel.

In this presentation of Christianity we shall find ourselves called upon to consider the question as to how the Christian revelation has come to the world, and involved therein are such matters as Divine inspiration, the trustworthiness of the Bible as a record of fact and experience, together with the evidences of the truth of the gospel as proclaimed by Christ and its fitness to meet human need. The development of doctrine within the Church, revealed in the various creeds and doctrinal statements, should likewise be noticed. Doctrines of the Church, the Priesthood, the Sacraments, and the Future Life form no small part of the content of what is distinctively Christian theology. Christian morality in its individual and social relationships as set forth in the family, Church, State, or nation demands attention. The life of the Church as an organization, its methods of government, its forms of worship, its missionary method, all form part of the subject-matter of theology.

This brief summary of the content of theology shows something of the magnitude of the field of study, and it may appear, at first, that things have been included which are somewhat remote from what has generally been associated with it. But an examination of any one of these lines of inquiry will show that it has a real bearing upon religion, and therefore can claim to be included in the science of religion. We speak the truth if we say that almost every sermon touches upon one or other of these themes. If it is true that in the old sense of the term preaching was theological, it is no less true now. We may not openly refer to our theology in technical terms, but consideration of the vast ground covered by theological study will reveal that, unless we are theological students in the best and widest sense of the term, our preaching will be less effective than it should be for the advancement of the Kingdom of God. There are some things mentioned in this survey which it would be folly to use as subjects for sermons. We have to present our matter in non-technical terms, we

have to guard against using language which is remote from common life, above all things we have to avoid unreality. But we have, at the same time, to present the truth, and if we refuse to recognize the legitimate claim of any of the lines of study here

noted we run grave risk of distorting that truth. Theology and preaching are big things, making big demands and giving big rewards. In proportion as we are big in relation to the one, so shall we be in the other.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Deflected Aim.

BY THE REVEREND A. BEAGHAN, EAST MOLESEY,
SURREY.

'Aim at what is above, where Christ is.'—Col 3¹
(Moffatt's Trans.).

I HAD an interesting talk the other day with a man who works in a torpedo factory, where they make those mysterious playthings for the Navy. He told me lots of wonderful things about torpedoes that I haven't time to tell you, except that they have to measure to the thousandth part of an inch when they make these baby battleships, for that is what they really are. Of course he couldn't tell me the secrets of the torpedo, but I asked him whether they could guide a torpedo with wireless yet. 'Yes, they can,' he said, 'and they can guide an aerial torpedo fired from an aeroplane in flight; at any rate, they have actually done it, though they haven't got the thing perfect yet.' He told me that they were able to guide a ship by wireless twenty years ago. I expect he thought I was very simple not to know that, but I didn't, and I expect if I made a guess I should find that you didn't know either.

But I learned something else about guiding ships by wireless, and I want to tell you about that really, and not about torpedoes. It sounds quite uncanny to think of a ship—a sort of mystery ship—out on the horizon, without a soul on board, sailing to some mysterious port, with a mysterious cargo, all under the control of a man who sits up in a tower, or at a desk, guiding the ship to its journey's end—the sort of thing you might easily see at the pictures; or like a Jules Verne story that scarcely anybody reads now, because, I suppose, so many of the things he yarned about have actually come to life. I found myself wondering why, if they knew

how to control ships by wireless twenty years ago, they don't do it now. Well, I'll tell you. They made another discovery when they tested this wonderful process. They were making a great demonstration before the big people of the naval world, and the model ship was being turned just wherever the controller wanted it to go in the harbour where they were testing it. When they had finished, and everybody was bursting with excitement at the success of it, a man who was watching said quietly, 'That thing's no use and I'll prove it.' So they had another test, and all went well for a time, and then suddenly the man who was controlling the model found that the thing wouldn't do as he wanted it, but went right off on its own. It was very puzzling until they found out the cause of the trouble. The man who said it was useless was at work with another set of apparatus, a more powerful set, and that was the reason the great men looked blank. It failed—because a greater power could master it and make it quite useless.

This is the great thing I got hold of from my talk with the torpedo man. There is a twofold power stronger than we are—a power for good and a power for evil. We are like that model battleship in one way: we are governed by the power of God our Father, for He has made us and has that power over us. It is not a hard, cruel power, nor is it that of a policeman waiting to catch us out. No! It is the power of Love—a power that draws us to our Father. But there is another power, greater than we are too. It is the power with the down-pull, the power of evil, and it can and does often conquer the power of God in us. We know that only too well, don't we? But which is the greater power? It just depends what we say about it. We can choose for ourselves. The ship couldn't choose, but you can and you must. We have to choose our Leader and we have got to fight. It's not easy, it's very hard, because however hard we

fight there is always that bad other self poking in and saying, 'What about me?'

St. Paul found it out and was not ashamed to tell us, 'When I want to do good, and be glad and happy and helpful, the bad old spirit is there, telling me it's no use trying to be good and helpful to others—no use at all! that I might just as well do what nearly everybody else does when things begin to get troublesome and I find myself "up against it." Just give up! In my heart I serve the master-spirit of good and love and light, but I seem to have another self that wants to serve the dark, bad master spirit of evil.' That's what St. Paul discovered, and you can make the same discovery any time you like, and I know you'll say, 'You're right.' Perhaps you have found it out already. You know how nice it is to lie in bed in the holidays or on Sunday mornings. You know, too, how a voice comes and says, 'Get up, old lazy-bones; what about giving a hand to mother, who's often "up against it" in doing her best to make you comfy and happy?' You've heard that voice, haven't you? And you've heard the other old dragon-voice too, that says sleepily and with a big yawn, 'Why should I?' And sometimes the bad old self has conquered, and you've rolled over and gone off to slumberland again. But sometimes, just now and again, the other voice has got the better of you, and out you've jumped, and felt that it was the best day you'd spent for a long time. And you're like the battleship, you're always in danger of being deflected from the path of serving Jesus into the mean, unhappy, selfish service of the bad old spirit of evil. This is the good news—that the power of love can conquer the other power. You've got to long for it to live in you. No sneaking longings for the bad spirit with its snappy, snarly, 'I want that and I'll have it, too,' or 'You're a nasty, horrid thing, and I'll not play with you again.'

What we need to know is, that there is really a greater power to make the other powerless. Which is the greater power? That's for you to say. If you are keen to serve Jesus, He is the greater Power. If you prefer the black, horrid things, the unkind word, the angry look; if you find that you don't mind cribbing, or that you are not particular whether you've got your own pen, or bat, or anything else that isn't yours, it looks as though you are telling everybody that the stronger power for you is the 'spirit of disobedience.' And that power will slowly deflect your aim, so that you can't aim straight.

It is easy to give way to the bad spirit; that is

why there are so many unhappy folk about. But we can and we must aim at kind, helpful things; at happy thoughts and brave, cheerful kindnesses; specially when we are feeling a bit like saying, 'I wonder whether it is really worth it.' I like to think that the laddie who gave his lunch to Jesus gave it after a bit of a struggle, knowing well that he might get nothing to eat till he got home, and it was evening then. But just watch his face as Jesus goes on breaking and breaking his little biscuits and dried fishes and with them feeds a whole crowd of people. It's worth it being unselfish. But it means keeping true to your aim, reminding yourself of it every day, and fighting to keep from the things that would deflect it.

Wings.

BY THE REVEREND ALEXANDER SMALL, B.D.,
BOREHAM WOOD, HERTS.

'Oh that I had wings!'—Ps 55⁶.

Were you not thrilled when you heard that Miss Amy Johnson had flown by herself across the world to Australia? Didn't you feel how brave she was, how daring, how clever? No wonder the King and Queen sent a message to her saying how pleased they were. Didn't it make you feel you wanted to do something brave too? With the wings of an aeroplane she braved the dangers of the air and mountains, and jungle and sea. I wonder if you said to yourself, 'I wish I had wings.'

Hundreds of years ago, long before there were balloons, or airships, or monoplanes, or biplanes, a man wanted to fly. One day he said to himself, 'Oh that I had wings!' But he didn't want wings because he was brave; he didn't want them because he wanted to face dangers and difficulties. Oh dear, no! He wanted them because he was afraid, because he was in danger, because life was hard, and he wanted to get away to some safe place where things would be easier for him. He had a fit of the blues, and so he said to himself, 'Oh that I had wings like a dove! Then would I fly away, and be at rest.' He wanted God to give him wings; but God wouldn't give him the wings he wanted, and as he knew nothing of airships or aeroplanes, he just had to stay where he was and face his dangers, and fight his difficulties, and overcome his fears, and God gave him something better than wings, He gave him courage and strength.

I wonder if you ever feel as that man did long ago. When you've got some hard lesson to learn at school, some difficult problem to do, do you want to get away from it to do something easier?

When mother wants you to do something for her, to water the flowers or to run an errand, do you pretend you don't hear, or do you feel like slipping out of the back door to your friends, whose voices you hear as they are playing in the street? That's just like saying, 'I wish I had wings.' But it's no good wishing. You haven't any wings, and it will be a long, long time before you feel them growing out of your shoulders. It's a good thing God hasn't given you wings to get away from difficulties and hardships. God won't give you wings to fly away, but He will give you the wings of love that will make you brave, and keep you true, and help you to face your difficulties and overcome them. That is something very much better, isn't it? And if you live day by day like that, doing the hard thing, life will be very beautiful; and if you do not receive a message from King George saying how brave you are, you will have something even better, the 'Well done' from the King of kings.

The Christian Year.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Jonathan.

'O Jonathan, thou wast slain in thine high places. I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan: very pleasant hast thou been unto me: thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women.'—2 S I^{25, 26}.

There are two contrasted orders of saints. One kind reaches the heights of life only with difficulty: temptations have ever beset them: they have had to fight a long and strenuous battle for the possession of their souls. Others seem to be saints quite naturally and spontaneously, like those rarely fortunate ones of whom Wordsworth tells:

There are who ask not if thine eye
Be on them; who, in love and truth,
Where no misgiving is, rely
Upon the genial sense of youth:
Glad Hearts! without reproach or blot;
Who do thy work, and know it not.

Jonathan is one of that lovelier order. He walks on the heights of life, and we see no marks of any inward conflict or strain.

We do not give to such men the credit they are due. Their goodness seems so easy, the natural blossom of their souls. The perfection of anything is a shy quality: its mark is a seeming effortlessness, an unconscious harmony and ease which do not obtrude or draw attention to themselves; and so it escapes observation. But what more delights the

seeing eye? And let us not imagine that the story of such as Jonathan is only an old story of long ago that touches us not. The saints are our bread of life. And when the story of a noble life is told and we see how lovely the character of man may be, we are listening to the voice of God whose unearthly music alone can recreate the soul.

Jonathan reveals the high quality of his soul in his relations with two men—David his friend and his father Saul.

I. In the real estimate of things, to love is greater than to be loved. That is not our ordinary thought. We take love as an evidence of the worth of the beloved. And Jonathan's passionate attachment to David becomes in our eyes only another gilding of the hero of Bethlehem. And certainly there must have been a rare charm about the shepherd lad of Bethlehem. There was his generosity and chivalry, so strange and remarkable in these rude days; his poetic sensibility that flashed in lovely image and arresting phrase; the power of song to which we are all so susceptible; and the physical beauty that gladdens the eye.

Love is its own rich and rare reward—when it is given to the worthy. Life has no greater blessing in its varied store. And Jonathan would not have counted his friendship for David among his virtues; he would have counted it his chiefest joy, for it made his days bright and full. But we can see the price it cost him: we can note the rare quality and amount of its unselfishness. For all worldly interest cried aloud against it. He could keep his love and friendship only in despite of pride and vanity and ambition.

First of all, David soon outstripped him in the people's favour; he became his successful rival in the race for glory. Now we have all a spice of vanity in us. It is Nature's provision that none of her children shall lack some savour in life, some spring of fresh hope and energy amid life's contradictions and disappointments. And there is nothing so intoxicating to human vanity as the glory whose stage is the wide resounding theatre of public life. Fame, says Milton, is the last infirmity of noble minds. When men have drunk of that heady draught, the thirst for it seldom leaves them. And Jonathan had drunk of it; he knew its intoxicating thrill. For he was the hero of Mich-mash. But now the shepherd lad of Bethlehem has come; he has slain Goliath. And the fickle populace have turned to him. To man's proud heart it is gall and wormwood to see another outstripping him in the race for fame. Jonathan saw it; he went through that fieriest of trials and neither

smoke nor smell of fire passed upon him. That reveals the sterling generosity in his soul.

And what of ambition, the dear desire for place and power? Now the monarchy was not as yet firmly established in the line of Saul. Any strong man who could capture popular favour might aspire to be king over at least some portion of the community. That was the possibility emerging for David. Saul saw it, for hatred, like love, sharpens the sight. And he said to his son, 'So long as David liveth, thou shalt not be established nor thy kingdom.' Jonathan knew it well, for once he said to his friend, 'Thou shalt be king in Israel, and I shall be next to thee.' That was his glad acceptance of his destiny. When Henry of Navarre was taunted with his change of religion he said gaily, 'Paris surely is worth a mass.' Was not the throne of Saul his father worth fighting for? Jonathan gave it up unrebelling. Had we not known that he was a brave soldier we might have said, Here is the policy of a craven spirit: he takes the second place who will not fight for the first. But Jonathan had no need to consider his reputation for courage: that was safe.

To the world's surprise that spiritual greatness shall be revealed some day. Here when men are successful we heap more and more laurels on their heads. This world worships the favourites of fortune. It is not so with God. In His presence the second oftentimes are first; shall not He who humbled Himself to the Cross hail him as one like-minded with Himself, a kindred soul who can enter into the fellowship of His mind and share in the inward rapture of His heart?

2. The other personal relation in which we see Jonathan is toward his father King Saul. That relationship is apt to be overlooked. But Jonathan shows himself as fine and perfectly tempered towards his father as towards David. And this side of his life and character is summed up for us in the tragedy on Mount Gilboa.

Must not Jonathan have been torn in twain as his father determined to do battle with the Philistines? He had been his father's right hand always. Saul had not been always a mere gloomy tyrant; he had a kingly nature, though at the last this was buried deep under the convulsions wrought by his jealousy of David: there had been possibilities of greatness where Jonathan would love to trace the real lineaments of the man. But with the clear vision that love gives, he must have seen the dark, fateful ending drawing nigh. King Saul had come to despair of himself; he felt abandoned by God and even by the soldier-like

qualities of his early days. And he went to consult witches and soothsayers. The battle with the Philistines was the gambler's last throw of the dice. Should he gird on his armour and go with Saul to the hopeless fight, or should he withdraw to David with whom was the promise of a brighter to-morrow? How many conflicts are there in the inward soul of a man, that none knows, where the greatest of issues are at stake! Jonathan's answer was to gird on his armour and confront death.

Certain lines of Keats tell the secret of all true spiritual greatness:

He ne'er is crown'd
With immortality, who fears to follow
Where airy voices lead.

That is no maxim of worldly prudence. But the men of real value, those who count in the long run and are not mere bubbles in the current, must have an ear to catch the soundless melodies of the spirit. The world will praise thee when thou doest well for thyself. So says the Psalmist, indulging in unusual irony. Jonathan will never earn such praise. The voices to which he listened called him to the second place, the shaded light of a more brilliant soul: they called him to support a failing cause, to venture his all in a desperate enterprise. But he never hesitated. These voices of love and loyalty were, his heart knew, the voice of God, for all the sweetness and the nobleness of life, all that makes a man respect himself, and shows him his life in a setting of glory, were in them.

As we follow that old-world story; as we contemplate his life and death, and think of all he was as well as of all he enjoyed and suffered, shall we not say—'Jonathan chose the better part: be my soul with him and with all the generous and the loyal, the loveliest and best of our race!'¹

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Friendless.

'Woe to him that is alone when he falleth; for he hath not another to help him up.'—Ec 4¹⁰.

The preacher here is calling for pity upon him that is alone when he falleth. He is thinking of suffering. But we may permit ourselves to think of moral catastrophe.

Do we recognize the fact that, many a time, it is not viciousness of disposition or outstanding weakness of will—certainly not deliberate choice of evil—that sends men on a downward path, but

¹ R. Glaister, *The Beauty of the Lord*, 81.

just sheer, dreary loneliness? Yes! and a loneliness that is only accentuated by nominal membership in a great city community. In the country-places, with the mountains and the sea and within him his heart to bear witness, a man may be alone rather than lonely. It is in the city, though round us crowds may be moving, that solitariness has its dwelling. As a man walks down a street, each lighted window speaks to him of companionship. Let him ring one of the bells and claim companionship! He laughs to think of the blank stares that would greet his intrusion. Companionship for them; and, all the more for that, loneliness for him. As he reflects bitterly, a group of friends pass him. They laugh together, intent the one on the other. But for him they have no more heed than for an inhabitant of another planet. What wonder if such a man, when night after night he returns to the solitude of his lodgings, reflects that companionship of a sort can be bought, or a temporary oblivion imbibed?

Now, it ought to be the part of the Christian Church to supply something of this lack. Certainly, in the first place, in regard to its own members. The Christian Church is a Christian family. So we are taught in the Lord's Supper. We must devise means of making that a more practical ideal. I know that there are difficulties, but we might open our houses more. Many congregations, I believe, do try to meet this problem. The ideal will be reached when, if a man or woman shall come and say that he or she is friendless, ministers will be able, in reply, to hand over their Communion Rolls, with the suggestion that these contain the names of, say, nine hundred odd friends for a start. There, at any rate, in one clear way, we shall be bearing one another's burdens and thus fulfilling the law of Christ.

Moreover, we shall be fulfilling the intention of man's Creator. The Almighty does not intend us to be alone; for He setteth the solitary in families. Which reminds us of a most important duty: keep strong and true the family bond. Endure, yield, be charitable up to the last limit of principle rather than break it.

But, when all is said and done, a certain loneliness is the portion of us all. There is a quality of loneliness in life's trials, and there is certainly a loneliness in our sins, from which we cannot escape. And it is there that we need to be reminded of the fact of Christ in God.

Now, for us to go to the solitary whom we could help and tell them that God loves them, and then leave them to that reflection, is manifest insincerity.

But it is not dealing with a vain thing for us to remind ourselves of the fact of the nearness of God in relation to trouble that must be borne alone.

First, let us remember that the Lord Christ knows that inner solitariness of our hearts through and through. It was His chief trial. He trod the winepress *alone*. There was no man—none to hear and none to answer. The burden and the shadow fell on Him; and the rest knew not that there was a burden or a shadow. If we bear the unspoken trial bravely, we are in His steps; and He is not far from them that follow Him.

And, second, if our loneliness be the loneliness of sin—and sin is always at the core lonely; Judas went out, and it was night—then let us remember God knows all about it, more than we do, and *still cares*. Yes, cares as Christ did; and that is, by the measurement of a Cross. If only that fact can bite into us, not only our solitariness, but our slavery, will die; and for our days here, in place of solitary guilt, there will be peace with God and the prospect of the satisfying of the heart's dearest desires, in the presence of the Father.¹

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Cure for Trouble.

'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me.'—Jn 14¹.

Is there a cure for trouble? Let us consider a few of the replies that have been given to this question.

1. The first remedy to be considered is the Stoic remedy. The Stoics of old maintained that there is a cure for trouble, that there is a means of healing the cruel aching of the heart, and their name for that cure was *Apathy*. 'Let all passion, all ardent attachment, die out of your nature,' they counselled. 'Give it all up. Desire nothing; hope for nothing. Accept the universe; take what comes; resign yourself patiently to the inevitable. The way of indifference is the way of peace.' Such was the teaching of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. And there are some persons in our own time who still find themselves attracted by the ancient Stoic wisdom.

Now it cannot be denied that there is something impressive and even splendid in the Stoic attitude. We cannot but admire the stern fortitude of these people. Nevertheless it is impossible to be satisfied with the Stoic remedy—simply for the reason that this cure for trouble costs too much. It can,

¹ J. R. P. Sclater, *The Enterprise of Life*, 299.

indeed, in a great measure, make us dead to pain ; but only by making us dead to joy as well as pain. And we simply cannot afford to pay so high a price. Even to be rid of trouble, we cannot, we dare not, sacrifice all the beauty and the brightness and the rich variety of our life. Let us look on the portraits of the Stoic worthies ; observe their settled melancholy, their dreary impassivity, their utter lack of buoyancy and high-spirited enthusiasm ; and then ask ourselves seriously whether we wish to become like them. Here, for instance, is Marcus Aurelius, emperor and philosopher, concerning whom a great scholar has written that ' Marcus had as little joy or hope as ever man had who got through a life of work without hanging himself.' Or here is George Eliot, coldly penning the famous letter in which, after comparing faith in God to ' taking opium,' she goes on to say, ' The highest " calling and election " is to do without opium, and live through all our pain with conscious, clear-eyed endurance.' Or here, again, is Matthew Arnold, another prophet of endurance, gazing out on the endless battle of good and evil in the world, and oh ! so weary of the strife that goes on and on and on and never issues into victory :

Creep into thy narrow bed,
Creep, and let no more be said !
Vain thy onset ! all stands fast.
Thou thyself must break at last.

Let the long contention cease !
Geese are swans, and swans are geese.
Let them have it how they will !
Thou art tired : best be still.

Love and joy and sympathy and hope and noble ambition are things too precious to be jettisoned, even for the sake of bringing the ship of the soul to anchorage in what Marcus Aurelius calls ' the untroubled peacefulness of a waveless bay.'

2. The second cure for trouble, in default of a better description, may be named the *Pleasure-Cure*. The idea of it is that a man may checkmate pain by plunging over head and ears into pleasurable distraction. ' Stifle your pain with amusements. Forget it in excitements.'

But does the pleasure-prescription answer ? Probably it often does in the case of the minor troubles of life. When one is worried or annoyed, it may be the best thing one can do to dine out or go to the theatre, and forget the annoyance if only for an evening. After the temporary respite one is fitter to contend with the obnoxious matter. But the pleasure-cure works only in the case of

the lesser troubles ; it breaks down irretrievably where the greater troubles are concerned. A mother is told in one day that her two soldier sons have fallen in the war ; a literary man, who gets his living by his writing, discovers that he is doomed to blindness ; a husband sees his idolized wife fading away beneath his eyes for want of common necessities which he is too poor to procure for her—will we venture to tell such people to go away, and divert themselves, and have some fun, and forget their troubles ? We may endeavour by this means to narcotize our suffering, but no pleasure can give us lasting alleviation, and the suffering continues with us just the same ; only now it has become the suffering of a cowardly and degraded mind, ' which,' as says Romola in George Eliot's novel, ' is the one form of sorrow which has no balm in it.'

3. Let us notice one other prescription. If we cannot find a cure for trouble in apathy or in pleasure, may we find it, perhaps, in *Work*—in doing the daily duty, in carrying out the allotted task conscientiously and strenuously, in fulfilling the engagement ? Is work the way to peace ? That was the conviction of the great novelist, Émile Zola. Some twenty years ago Zola addressed to the students of Paris a remarkable oration in which he spoke of his own work and of the consolation it had brought to him. ' I,' said he, ' have had but one faith, one strength—work ! What has sustained me was the enormous labour I set myself. . . . How often in the morning have I sat down to my table . . . tortured by some great sorrow, physical or mental ! And each time—in spite of the revolt my suffering has caused—after the first moments of agony, my task has been to me an alleviation and a comfort.' And he continued, ' From the time one accepts the task, and from the time one begins to fulfil it, it seems to me that tranquillity should come even to the most tormented.'

But work is not genuinely remedial, although it is a great help. Work by itself cannot mend a broken heart.

4. So far, then, we have failed to find by human ingenuity an effectual cure for trouble. Let us now turn to One who is named the Good Physician. What remedy has He to offer ? ' Let not your heart be troubled : ye believe in God, believe also in me.' This is the *Religion-cure*, and somehow it seems to go down to the very root of the matter. Let us observe for a moment its terms. First, ' ye believe in God.'

When the Cardinal Legate from Rome had an interview with Luther at Augsburg, he said to him

furiously: 'The Pope's little finger is stronger than all Germany. Do you expect your princes to take up arms to defend *you*? I tell you, No! And where will you be then?' And Luther answered, 'Where I am now: in the hands of Almighty God.'

And it was the same Luther who used often to say to Melancthon in the stormy days of the Reformation: 'Come, Philip, let us sing the forty-sixth psalm, "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble."' Yes, to be certain of God, to be certain that God cares for us, to be certain that God knows all about our suffering, and is controlling it to the working out of a wise and beneficent purpose, to be certain that, even in the most desperate circumstances and situation, we are still grasped and sustained by a Providence that we can absolutely trust—this is to be mailed against adversity. In the strength of such faith in God, we can confront 'the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune'; we can echo the words of Pascal, 'Thou alone knowest what is expedient for me. . . . Give to me or take away from me, only conform my will to Thine'; we can say with General Gordon, 'My Friend is with me, and I am quieted with the knowledge of His rule'; we can sing with the Quaker poet:

In all the maddening maze of things,
And tossed by storm and flood,
To one fixed state my spirit clings—
I know that God is good.

'Ye believe in God'—that first. But let us not forget the second clause of Christ's prescription—'Believe also in me.' Jesus our Lord, Jesus Himself—is He not at once the example and the guarantee of a heart untroubled in the midst of trouble? He came and lived this troubled life of ours. He drank of the cup of sorrow. And this, that He might show us how to triumph over trouble, and change 'the bitter water of our affliction into the wine of joy and gladness.' The Man of Sorrows offers Himself as Sorrow's Healer. And as we look on Him, and conform ourselves to His image, do we not learn to meet our troubles with the same heavenly mind? We share His unflinching trust in the love of God, His willing and cheerful acceptance of the all-righteous Will of God, His eagerness to devote Himself at any cost to God's service; and, sharing so much, we share also His happy experience of inward peace in the midst of outward agitation. Let us think of Carlyle's magnificent apostrophe to Marie Antoinette, led bound to her execution: 'Far as the eye reaches, a multitudinous sea of maniac heads; the air deaf with

their triumph-yell! The Living-dead must shudder with yet one other pang; her startled blood yet again suffuses with the hue of agony that pale face, which she hides with her hands. There is, then, *no* heart to say, God pity thee? O, think not of these; think of Him whom thou worshippest, the Crucified,—who also treading the wine-press *alone*, fronted sorrow still deeper; and triumphed over it, and made it holy; and built of it a "Sanctuary of Sorrow," for thee and all the wretched!'¹

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Father of Jesus.

'God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'—
Ro 15⁶.

This is the most daring and the most evolutionary title that was ever given to God by men. Yet to-day it often falls from our lips, a grandiloquent and sonorous phrase from which the meaning has well-nigh faded.

1. Wherever the expression occurs in the New Testament, it always betrays a mounting wave of emotion in the writer's breast. In the religious lands of the East the pious worshipper never uses the name of God without muttering after it, 'Blessed be His name.' The first Christians never spoke the words, 'The Father of our Lord Jesus,' without murmuring some such words of adoration, 'Blessed be He!' All the feelings of awe and reverence and self-abasement which used to visit these sons of a desert faith when they thought on the Nameless One—the Unseen, the Eternal, the Supreme—transferred mysteriously and made to cluster round the words, 'The Father of Jesus!' When they wanted to make the most solemn asseveration, as if under the All-seeing Eye, it was the Father of our Lord they called to witness. 'The God and Father of our Lord Jesus,' wrote Paul in that letter of vehement, protesting sorrow to the recalcitrant Church at Corinth, 'The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not.' The sound of the words was a summons to worship and to glorify. It is so in the example we have chosen as a text, chosen merely because it is the first occasion of its use in the New Testament. All the others are either in thanksgiving or in prayer, benediction, or doxology. At the very beginning of the letter to Colosse, Paul writes: 'We give thanks to God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you.' It is an opening doxology

¹ F. H. Dudden, *The Delayed Victory*, 17.

in the Epistle to the Ephesians: 'Blessed be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ.' In the heart of that Epistle we see the outward as well as the inward demeanour which the words inspired: 'I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom every family in heaven and on earth is named.' It comes at length as a ray of heavenly sunlight after the storm-clouds had rolled away from Corinth: 'Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort.' For two nights and a day the forbidding Cross has kept a broken-hearted disciple from unsaying his denial; but he has hardly put pen to paper long after, when in a burst of doxology we catch the reflection of the Resurrection glory which scattered his despair: 'Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again to a living hope by the raising of Jesus Christ from the dead.'

2. Perchance, to-day, we might get back behind the cold, formal ring it seems to have too often when we thrust it into our devotions, and recall a few faint gleams of its old radiance by pondering over it in humble meditation. 'The Father of our Lord Jesus'—let us try to carry the words back on the wings of fancy to the quiet circle of the hills round Nazareth, and to the shores of the Lake of Galilee.

On the streets of the little country town we meet a young man as He goes to and from His day's work with His tool-bag slung over His shoulder. And when we venture to exchange greetings with Him, we pass on with a vague and puzzled impression of something not quite ordinary about the Man. What sort of home has He sprung from?

The days pass, and led by some impulse we turn in to converse with Him by the bench, for we want to know Him closer. And He lifts upon us great, dark, luminous eyes. And the unsolved puzzle in our minds about His pedigree gives way to a feeling of startled wonder. That something about the Man had nothing to do with the delicacy of human nurture. It is a rare thing that stands confronting us. To use an expressive phrase of the street to-day, it is a white soul.

Days pass, and weeks, and we meet Him again by the Lake, a Teacher with a few unlettered followers round Him, and the crowds hanging upon His words. Suppose we approach one of these disciples and begin to question him. . . . 'You ask me why do I follow Him? Why, because He has brought me into the presence of God. Yes,

He knows God, knows the Most High, the Ever Blessed One. No, I never inquired about His parents, or His home.' . . . And the flame kindles in his eyes as, with a sudden access of conviction that takes your breath away, the disciple says, 'The God of Jesus, the God the Master is always speaking of—and speaking to—*He* is the Father of Jesus. I cannot tell how, but I know. He has made me so sure, so sure. Come with me and listen to Him awhile.' And we draw near and listen.

Yes, He is talking about Someone, very reverently and yet in the most *intimate* and familiar way. A breath blows out of the open skies and fans your cheek—a breath from the Unseen. Gentle and pure like the trembling light from a pulsing star, but convinced that He was sent; sensitive, yet all His sensitiveness transformed into Divine strength—He seems to be speaking about Someone who is beside Him, all about Him—lending a glory to the red lily at His feet; a joy to the wheeling flight of the birds overhead; a wave of life beating down through the sunshine that sweeps along the hillside; falling through the rain on the springing corn in the valley; and whispering in His heart. Someone all-great, all-knowing, without whom not a sparrow falls, who sees in secret, who can be spoken to anywhere, and, best of all, alone. He calls Him the heavenly Father.

And in the twilight, as we climb the hillside, the memory of those eyes of arresting purity, and the radiant smile, and the strong reposeful face, comes back to us. And His words, startling in their beauty, their depth, their simplicity—why, they were alive! . . . Mad? *He* mad? Nay, but the one soul of perfect sanity in a world awry! It is we—we, who are suffering from illusions—great thick clouds of suspicion and doubt and care and fear, that shut God out of life. And as we approach the hill-top when the first few faint stars begin to show, we hear the voice of one engaged in earnest talk. Dimly we discern a figure all alone. And faintly, borne on the night breeze, we catch at intervals the words, 'O my Father,' 'Holy Father,' 'O Father, Lord of heaven and earth.' And we steal away. We, too, have become like the disciple fisherman. Without another question we repeat, 'The God of Jesus is the Father of Jesus. I know not how or why, but it is so.'

3. We think of Him as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, not merely because Jesus was so intimate with Him, but because Jesus was so *satisfied* with Him. But in those remote highland glens of Galilee, what could He know, we are fain

to ask, of the great world with its passions of greed and hate and lust that drench the world with blood, its envy and its misery, its sorrow and shame, its anguish and despair? His was a sheltered life, and in solitary brooding and communing with God among the hills He never had need to question Him about the darkness and sorrow of the world.

To say that Christ knew little of life because He was not a city child in touch with the great world is simply to blind one's eyes to the truth. All the known facts of His life are dead against it. He knew what sorrow meant, and hunger. He had stood by the dying Joseph's bed. Chief mourner, He had followed the coffin to the grave—only a boy. He knew what cruelty and avarice could be when turned against an unprotected widow mother. He had to battle with temptation in most powerful forms, and with despair. Yet there never flitted across His mind so much as a shadow of dissatisfaction with the God who kept Him company all the time. Shall not God clothe you—feed you, as He clothes the lilies, feeds the birds? Your heavenly Father knows. He greatly cares. Looking up to God in every vicissitude of life, He was perfectly satisfied with Him.

But more than that, beside sin and misery, in their most tangled and hopeless forms, He found the forgiving love of God equal to the worst that the human soul could bring upon itself. To the bitter end He was perfectly satisfied with God.

'To the bitter end?' What, then, of the agony of the Garden? Was that not a wrestling of His human will with God's? No, it was not even a questioning of God's will for Him, as He staggered

beneath the burden. But as the shadows were deepening round Him, He saw one awful spot on the way ahead of Him. That the intimate fellowship with His Father should be broken even for a moment—that was what He fain would forgo. But He only prayed, 'If it be possible, let this cup pass.' And all the time of that dread agony and sweat and prayer the name on His lips was 'Father.' It is because Peter could not forget the almost unbearable pathos of it, when he tells the story, that he quotes the very word of His mother-speech which Jesus used on this occasion, 'Abba! Abba!'—still satisfied.

But that awful cry of God-forsakenness from the Cross? Was not all His satisfaction in God disannulled by that word? Nay, He is still crying up to God through the black pall that lay upon His soul. And how does He address Him? Does He cry, 'O God, if there be a God?' Does He say, 'Great and terrible unseen Being, whoever you are?' No, but 'My God, My God.' Oh, the love that would not let God go, even in that hour of shuddering eclipse on the Cross! Oh, the love and trust that conquered with a sigh: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit'!

How perfect must be the God who could satisfy such a man! A stainless, flawless soul—there must be no shadow cast by turning, no darkness at all in the God who could satisfy such as He. Greater love was never shown by man for men than by this Jesus on the Cross. Surely the God with whom He was well pleased must be a great Well of love unutterable.¹

¹ J. A. Robertson, in *United Free Church Sermons*, 180.

'The Cambridge Ancient History' and the Old Testament.

BY THE REVEREND W. M. MATHIESON, B.D., BROUGHTY FERRY.

II.

The Old Testament History.

WE use the term 'The Old Testament History' to indicate the period and the events covered by the narrative portions of OT Scripture, namely, the sixteen hundred years or so from the era of Hebrew origins in Abraham to the time of the consolida-

tion of ecclesiastical or theocratic Judaism under Nehemiah and Ezra. This epoch, roughly 2000–400 B.C., constitutes the range of national incidents and developments with which the Biblical writers deal in those books of Jewish Sacred Scripture

which may be described as historical. These OT records have been surveyed in a previous article as we see them scrutinized, and their value estimated, in the pages of the *C.A.H.* by the scientific historical student. In the present article we proceed to consider how the OT history emerges when the sources, Biblical and external, have been examined and used by the present-day historian, such as Dr. S. A. Cook in the relevant chapters of the first six volumes of the *C.A.H.*

The advantage of studying the OT history in these volumes (I., II., III., and VI. are those which contain chapters dealing directly with the Biblical material) is that we are enabled to view it in its true international relationships. Any presentation of OT history must, of course, bring in nations other than the Israelites; the Bible itself contains many references to foreign peoples. But in such a case the surrounding peoples appear rather as 'background,' with the OT events and personages engaging the attention in a dominating manner. In the *C.A.H.* each nation of the ancient world of South-West Asia and the Mediterranean from time to time steps into the foreground, while the others form the background. One's point of view is constantly being shifted, and one is enabled to survey the whole historical field in truer perspective and proportions. When, in the course of this process, the OT history comes at various eras into our more immediate field of vision we are in a position to look at it with a new interest and power of apprehension. Probably two impressions are left on the mind, impressions which might seem at first to be contradictory.

One effect of viewing the OT history in the context of the *C.A.H.* is that it *shrinks*. When the OT itself was our chief source for ancient history the Israelite story bulked large and significant: Palestine and its people during the Biblical epoch filled a great space in the history of mankind's past. As we see it now, Israelite history is no less significant from the spiritual standpoint; it is even more extraordinary and meaningful and pregnant. But it is much less significant—and this helps to enhance its spiritual pre-eminence—from the purely political standpoint. It was hardly ever, save to some extent at the epoch of David and Solomon, a truly independent national history. Other national and imperial powers literally walked over it and through it and round it, obscuring its existence and often threatening it with extinction. Nor was it by any means a very ancient history. Archaeological finds and historical investigation are raising curtain after

curtain which had hidden the ancient world from us. Even when traced back to its Hebrew beginnings in the Abrahamic migration, contemporary probably with Babylon's Golden Age under Hammurabi and with the Twelfth Dynasty in Egypt, Israel's story comes after the most brilliant periods of ancient history: politically it may be described as quite a *fin de siècle* affair. Further, Hebrew-Israelite-Judaic history is not only dwarfed when our view of the long and complicated story of the Semitic Middle East is enlarged; it is still further diminished when we realize that the ancient Semitic world was itself no more a closed and independent system than was the OT history. The Semitic empires and cultures of Amurru (Syria and eastwards towards the Euphrates), Babylonia, and Assyria were in many respects the heirs of an earlier non-Semitic power, the Sumerians. Elamites, too, played their part in the early history of Mesopotamia. In the northern regions Indo-European influence made itself felt through the Hittite confederation in Asia Minor, and also by the channel of Mitanni. Westward, non-Semitic influences also came in from the region of the Ægean and the Levant. Egypt likewise was constantly penetrating Palestine and Syria, through seaports and by landward routes, with her armies and civilization. While the Semitic area and its more or less indigenous inhabitants always exercised a strong power of Semitization upon incomers, it now appears to be more and more difficult to say what constitutes distinctive Semitic culture and racial character. Thus, with the widening of racial horizons and the lengthening of historical vistas, the OT history has shrunk.

At the same time, that history has been *enriched*—enriched with new details and fresh points of contact with other national stories. If in one sense it has shrunk, in another sense it has been enlarged; that is the second impression left by considering the Israelite people in the setting provided by the *C.A.H.* Not only has the course of events with which the OT deals suffered no spiritual diminution or impoverishment, it has been linked up in many interesting and important ways with the wider world. While the OT writers make clear the religious significance of the events they are describing, modern utilization of external evidence often helps us to see the international implications of these same events. If the scale of the stage has been reduced as regards the internal history of Israel, the interaction of causes and effects in the drama has sometimes been made clearer and the interplay of tribal and national influences has been made more intelligible.

We see the importance from the point of view of high imperial politics, and of race movements, of the little land in which Israel's 'children' found a home. We see them not just as an isolated and self-contained family. Their kinship with some of their neighbours, and the consequences of that kinship, are more evident and meaningful, as are also the ways in which their family life, while maintaining its special characteristics, was diversified or threatened by intrusive elements. The windows of Israel's house have been flung open in various directions, and we are able to look out of them and see something of the world of men and events that met Israel's eyes, motivated Israel's actions, helped to feed Israel's mind, and often perplexed Israel's spirit. God's training and discipline of Israel take a new point and definiteness as we see the nation in its various reactions to, and interactions with, peoples of higher political and cultural but lower spiritual achievements.

If, however, when we turn to the special OT chapters in the *C.A.H.* we expect to find that Dr. Cook has presented us with a clearer outline of Israelite history, a more easily grasped sequence of development, and a more closely articulated scheme of periods and phases, we shall be grievously disappointed. While most minutely analysing and ransacking the available OT sources—indeed, as a result of so doing—and while utilizing all available external evidence—and again as a consequence of this—Dr. Cook finds himself forced to confess that it is impossible to present his readers with a reliable account of the whole process of Israelite history or with satisfying descriptions of most of its main epochs. Dr. Cook marshals all the material in the form which it assumes after stringent historical appraisal, and, in effect, leaves us with what is still material for history rather than history itself—material that cannot yet be fully utilized because insufficient in quantity and inadequate in quality. His conscience as a scientific writer of history will not allow him to present reconstructions of many of the periods, because he does not believe that a dependable and defensible reconstruction is yet possible. This reluctance of Dr. Cook to reconstruct the history in any kind of detail is due to the fact, noted in our first article, that he sets a low estimate on the historical value of the sources with which the OT provides us. Many will feel that the estimate is too low, and that the consequent hesitation to reconstruct the history is at some points excessive. Such will find some consolation in the view of one of our most eminent historians of the ancient east, Dr. H. R. Hall, from whose pen comes

the following¹: 'The present writer takes a somewhat more hopeful view than Dr. Cook of the possibility of reconstituting the early history of Israel from the admittedly often self-contradictory Jewish legends aided by contemporary monumental evidence. At any rate, it is the duty of the historian to try to make as probable a reconstruction as he can on the basis of our knowledge, which means fitting the native legends preserved in the Old Testament as plausibly as he can into the framework provided by the contemporary data, at first Egyptian chiefly, later Assyrian. And as time goes on we shall be able to do this with greater certainty. Personally I am not disposed to admit that we have not reached quite reliable results already, especially on the archaeological side.'

If Dr. Cook believes that the day for reconstruction, certainly for any kind of detailed or elaborate reconstruction, has not yet come, he has in his chapters assembled all the materials at present accessible for such reconstruction; and at the same time he has indicated many considerations and points of view which he believes must be taken into account in any rewriting of Israel's story. Nor is it to be imagined that the reader will leave Dr. Cook's pages uninstructed in the trend and significance of the OT history. Every era is treated, and an attempt made to let the student have a well-proportioned survey of what there is to be seen. We may therefore proceed to notice in very brief form what Dr. Cook has to say about some of the chief epochs.

Dr. Cook's account of *Abraham*, and the Biblical representation of national origins in connexion with him (i. 233-237), comes at the end of a description of the situation in Syria and Palestine towards the close of the third millennium B.C. Of events and conditions in that epoch the OT sources 'preserve only the faintest echoes'; the records, written from much later points of view and containing traditions of varying age and interest, 'proceed chiefly from Southern Palestine, and seek to explain how the great ancestors entered the land and made their way to the south.' Dr. Cook accepts the Abrahamic movement as contemporary with Hammurabi, the sixth king of the First Babylonian Dynasty; or at least he believes that the Biblical writers intended Abraham to be dated in that age.² He

¹ *The People and the Book* (1925), edited by the late Professor A. S. Peake, chapter on 'Israel and the Surrounding Nations,' p. 9, footnote 1.

² The date of Hammurabi's reign which formerly found much acceptance was 2123-2081 B.C. This is almost certainly too high. Professor Langdon would

does not ascribe much value to Gn 14 as reliable historical evidence for Abraham and his age, even though Amraphel of Shinar is 'presumably' Hammurabi of Babylonia. The following quotation on this point introduces us to a characteristic feature (cf. I. 194, 222; and many references in the course of his chapters in the later volumes) of Dr. Cook's historical criticism of the Biblical records, namely, his insistence that so-called 'primitive' features in a narrative do not mean that the narrative is to be accepted as coming down from primitive times and as being of truly ancient date and origin. 'Tradition has doubtless preserved some genuine names and possible situations; but in its present form the narrative [Gn 14] is late, and it was especially in the Persian period (c. fifth century B.C.) that Babylonians themselves were keenly interested in the early relations between Elam and their land. The names Abram and Abraham are found in Babylonia in the First Dynasty—the latter as a small farmer—and we have seen that those of Jacob and (possibly) Israel are no less ancient, and that those of the Hebrews and perhaps Yahweh may be traced. But the names in the Biblical narratives are more ancient than what is said of them; and although certain social usages in Genesis can be illustrated from Hammurabi's code of laws, they are in no wise peculiar to that remote period and do not prove the antiquity of their context' (I. 236). As regards the general significance of the story of the Abrahamic migration, connecting the patriarch both with Ur and with Haran, Dr. Cook's point of view may be summarized in the following sentence: 'A relationship is felt, partly with Babylonia, partly with the semi-nomad Aramæan and related population of the desert, and partly, also, with the Aramæan and more or less Hittite districts of the more cultured Haran and the north' (I. 237).

Another originative and decisive period on which the Biblical narratives concentrate is the *Exodus*. That the exact period and the precise character of this event are still very far from being ascertained by use either of the Biblical sources or any available external evidence, is the conviction of Dr. Cook. The one point on which he seems quite clear is the absolute impossibility of finding a place for any such spectacular, sweeping, coherent and large-scale movement as the OT records narrate in the region and period to which it seems to be ascribed by the writers. In what period the event which forms the

basis of the Biblical elaborated tradition should be located by the present-day historian, Dr. Cook confesses that he can give little guidance. Rejecting any dates before or after the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Egyptian Dynasties as chronologically improbable, he would tend to limit the admissible range to the period between Thutmose III. and Merneptah, *i.e.* roughly 1500–1200 B.C. Within that period falls the movement of the Habiru into Palestine (c. 1400–1370 B.C.) which is revealed in the Tell el-Amarna correspondence. But Dr. Cook gives no support to the idea that this can represent the Biblical Exodus and Conquest. 'The divergence between the conditions described in the OT and the contemporary evidence [of the Tell el-Amarna tablets] is crucial' (II. 357). The general conclusion reached by surveying contemporary conditions over a lengthy period and by an analysis of the various traditions combined in the Biblical account is somewhat as follows. Only some Israelite tribes were ever in Egypt: 'the historical kernel is the descent and exodus of some relatively small band' (II. 358). Further, the traditions of any such exodus from Egypt seem to have been influenced by the reminiscence of movements up into Palestine of nomads or semi-nomads from the region lying between the south of Judah and Egypt proper, a district which is a kind of eastern extension of Egypt. Traces are also preserved of tribal history indicating that some branches of the Israelite people had traditions of settlement in Palestine quite different from the story of a conquest following on a sojourn in Egypt. Indeed, the original patriarchal traditions do not seem to point forward to any other kind of occupation of the land than that which they themselves indicate. We noticed earlier in this article that the patriarchal movements, proceeding in the direction Schechem–Bethel–Hebron–Beer-sheba, tended to concentrate on the occupation of the southern region. We may here quote a passage which indicates a constant theme of Dr. Cook in his examination of the records and the history. It gives a clue to his view of the whole trend of events and of the character of many of the sources. Dealing with the settlement and distribution of the tribes in the land, he says: 'The importance of some specific body of southern tradition is, however, unmistakable, and it is further enhanced by what is known of the Levites, their distribution over Palestine, and their subsequent congregating round Jerusalem. The names of the Levitical divisions are closely connected with Moses and his family, and also with Judah and south Palestine, Edom included. Their entrance and distribution could

now put the reign at 2067–25; while others would reduce it much further, *e.g.* Dhorme to 1955–13 (*Revue Biblique*, July 1928, p. 376, in the course of an article on 'Abraham dans le Cadre de l'Histoire').

readily account for some of the traditions of migration and movement; and it is noteworthy that among the Biblical traditions are some which represent specifically south Palestinian and local standpoints, and that certain families of the scribes were akin to the clans who definitely claimed a south Palestinian or Edomite origin (1 Ch 2⁵⁵). In this way we could explain the *presence* in the OT of various traditions, although whether they are trustworthy is quite another question. Nor can we say that the historical events they reflect necessarily belong to the pre-monarchical age' (II. 368; cf. VI. 184-186).

In the *Age of the Monarchy*, alike at its inception and at various subsequent points, the considerations in the above quotation are kept in mind. For the initial period of the monarchy Dr. Cook on the whole tends to accept as trustworthy the representation which these south Palestinian sources give, although indicating that they probably contain reflection of the much later conditions of post-Exilic times in Judah. He stresses the importance of the investigations and results set forth by Ed. Meyer and B. Luther in *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (1906). David's early career is to be dissociated from that of Saul as regards any personal relationship. He belongs to the south country and, as events develop, moves northwards into an almost alien district, his stay and rule at Hebron being a stage of progress as much geographical as political. In the subsequent monarchical period, from David's capture of Jerusalem right down to the fall of the city in 586 B.C., the division between north and south is emphasized, with its consequent lack of political cohesion despite certain times of rapprochement. This, however, was far from being an era of exclusiveness. Dr. Cook is insistent on the fact that all through these centuries there were new infusions from the nomadic or semi-nomadic neighbours of the Israelites. Whether introduced by conquerors, or more frequently introducing themselves as opportunity offered and the cultivated lands enticed, new-comers were a source of real strength, often bringing physical and spiritual reinforcement from the more austere life of the desert into the agricultural and urban life of Palestine. Throughout the history of the monarchical period it is made clear how Israelite power could expand only at such eras as the surrounding empires were either weak or pre-occupied with their own concerns; hence the expansion under David and Solomon, and later in the time of Jeroboam II. of Ephraim and Uzziah of Judah. When Egypt or Assyria cared to intervene, the

little Israelite kingdoms were helpless. And so the end came when, in the wake of Assyria and as heir to her conquests, Babylonia laid Jerusalem waste and made Judah desolate though not deserted.

When Dr. Cook brings us into the periods of the *Exile and Restoration* he stresses the importance of what happened in the land of Judah itself rather than among the exiles. While the historical sources of the OT for these periods are meagre, and the indications of the course of events in the years from the Return of 538 B.C. (a numerically insignificant movement in Dr. Cook's view) till the days of Ezra (whom Dr. Cook inclines to date c. 397 B.C., i.e. after Nehemiah) are scanty, yet the post-Exilic period contained certain events and vicissitudes which are indirectly witnessed to by the records of the whole preceding period of Israel's story. This is the age when the OT historical and other records took their present form; and, in the opinion of Dr. Cook, these documents betray conditions and points of view (a possible revolt against Persia under Zerubbabel, and a fresh disaster to Jerusalem in consequence; monarchical *versus* high-priestly ideas and ambitions; a time of relapse into primitive conditions reflected in writings originating or compiled in this age) of which we have no direct account. The various documentary sources P, D, and even JE all contain evidence of processes of compilation or authorship which are best explained by the circumstances of these obscure yet important generations of the inauguration of Judaism in the sixth-fifth centuries B.C.

If it be thought that in the *C.A.H.* the OT history receives a merely political or cultural treatment, let it be understood that, over and above those valuable sections which deal explicitly with the development of Israel's religion, the spiritual significance of the history is not lost sight of. To indicate this we may close with some eloquent words of Dr. Cook at the end of his contribution in vol. VI. (pp. 198 f.). 'Thus does the history of a petty people hidden away in the vast Persian Empire raise the profoundest problems of national genius, its contribution to the world's history, and the price it has to pay. The genius of Israel showed itself in her prophets, story-tellers and psalmists, and in her ideas of religion and history. Genius has its conspicuous defects: that of the Semites, and especially Israel, not least of all. Yet through her genius Israel's history was what it was; and she was able both to interpret and to shape her history in a way no other people has done or could do. No other people found and made their national history so supremely significant, so worthy of interpretation

and of preservation. She alone of all peoples earned the right to set forth for mankind that which she learnt at the cost of heavy sacrifices. Poignant experiences and their re-expression in a theistic exposition of history constitute Israel's unique

contribution, and this gift becomes doubly precious as fuller knowledge of the facts of ancient history is bringing a re-interpretation of the past which is placing the Old Testament and the function of Israel in a new and larger framework.'

Biblical Archaeology.

By THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, M.A., GLENFARG, PERTSHIRE.

IN the April *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund we have an interesting record of the research carried out by the Society since its inception in 1865. Almost every aspect of scientific, historical, and literary work has been undertaken, and the reports have appeared not only in the *Quarterly Statements* but in *Memoirs* and recently in *Annals*. The value of such work to the Biblical student is evident, for the special legacy of Palestine can only be rightly understood when the conditions, resources, and material relics of the country are taken into account. Two or three years ago the Society widened its scope by entering into closer co-operation with the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem (established in 1919), and the two together are promoting a large amount of field-work in Palestine, and especially excavation on ancient sites. They hope to undertake at least one more spell of work to recover the remains of the earliest Jerusalem, already partially excavated in 1923-25 by Professor Macalister and Rev. Garrow Duncan, and again in 1928 under Mr. Crowfoot. It is possible that Ophel, the ancient Zion or city of David, and the site of the royal necropolis of the Kings of Judah, may yet yield archæological finds of surprising importance.

In addition to these and other British societies, there are numerous continental and American ones working in Palestine on similar lines, with the result that valuable archæological and documentary material, illustrative of Israelite life and thought, has been rapidly accumulating of late. At Megiddo (*Tell el-Mutesellim*), where the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago is at work, the numerous standing monoliths unearthed have now been identified as hitching-posts and supporting pillars in the stables, and this will affect the interpretation of similar monoliths elsewhere in Palestine, as at Taanach, Tell Fara, and Beth-shean. These 'tie-

stones' are believed to have belonged to Solomon's stables, and if further discoveries of them are made at other cities, the Hebrew historian's claim that the great king had several cavalry centres and four thousand stalls for his horses may receive corroboration. At *Tell en-Nasbeh* (believed by some to be Mizpeh of Benjamin), seven miles north of Jerusalem, the recent discoveries of Dr. Badé reveal the existence of an enormous Israelite city, with suburbs outside the wall, testifying to a large and prosperous population in the period between Samuel and the Exile. At ancient Shiloh (*Seilân*), a Danish expedition has been at work for some time, and has succeeded in unearthing some churches with interesting and beautiful mosaics. This is one of the sites which should prove of great interest to the Biblical student, for it has not only been a place of pilgrimage for Jews, Christians, and Moslems, but was the seat of early Israelite worship. It is one of the sites which, like Ai and Jericho, can assist in determining the date and character of the Hebrew conquest. At Mamre (*Râmet el-Khalîl*), where the well of Abraham is, most interesting discoveries have been made by A. E. Mader, working under German auspices. The site of Abraham's oak has, it is believed, been located, as well as that of his altar, and parts of a pavement (a *via sacra*) leading from the main road to an ancient sanctuary adjoining the well have been discovered. Canaanite and Israelite potsherds have been found, together with undoubted samples of pottery belonging to the First Bronze Age (2600-2000 B.C.). If, as Dr. Albright says, this place is 'unquestionably the true site of Mamre,' considerable light may yet be thrown on the life of Abraham and his family, who dwelt here so long.

At practically all the Palestinian sites which are being excavated the 'diggings' are yielding increasingly important results, inasmuch as each

successive excavation benefits from the accumulated observations of its predecessors. Work is being carried on this year by American societies at Megiddo, Tell Beit Mirsim (sixteen miles south-west of Hebron), Tell Fara, Balâtah (Shechem), 'Ain Shems (Beth-Shemesh), Seilûn, Mughâret el-Wad, Tell Ghassûl, and by Professor Garstang at Jericho.

The resumption of the long-discontinued operations by Harvard University at Samaria, where important ostraca were found, is also promised soon. With so many foreign scholars, in addition to British ones, at work on the buried cities of Palestine, the future augurs well for Biblical Archæology.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Jewish Dispersion.¹

HERR GEORG ROSEN, for fourteen years German consul at Jerusalem, interested himself in archaeological and historical researches into early Judaism, but his manuscript was lost at Cairo in 1891. His son, Friedrich, also in the Eastern German service, edited notes made afresh by his father, and finally handed over the materials to Professor Georg Bertram of Giessen, who is responsible for the present shape of the thesis, which is enriched by many notes on the Old and the New Testaments.

The two theses of the monograph are not unfamiliar, and they are closely connected. One is, that the Diaspora was a mission enterprise, and the other, that the Phœnicians were absorbed in the Jewish nation thus expanding. Both contentions, especially the first, are, of course, rejected by many critics. Thus it has been commonly held that the Diaspora was the inevitable result of Jews being forced into exile, and not a deliberate missionary enterprise. Also, there is serious scepticism about any theory which attempts to account for the disappearance of a race like the Phœnicians by conjecturing that they were so akin to the Jews that fusion took place. But it is always well to have a hypothesis freshly stated, and this monograph is welcome and timely, if only for the new arrangement of data, based on a study of archæological evidence and historical probabilities.

The former thesis (pp. 22-68) endeavours to meet the theory that deportation accounts for the Diaspora, as well as the view, held by Renan and others, that the prolific birth-rate of the Jews and the inability of a small land like Palestine to hold

the population led to emigration. Herr Rosen is thus obliged to work in his second thesis (pp. 5-21, 69 f.), for scholars, like Movers, have held that the Diaspora was largely due to the Phœnician slave-trade, which scattered Jews far and wide over the East. He admits this as one factor, but refuses to regard it as an adequate explanation of the Dispersion in general. According to him the Jewish race is not purely Jewish. He agrees here with Renan, who denied that there was any Jewish type of a specific racial character. But Rosen thinks that the variety of the types in Judaism goes back to a fusion of Phœnician and Jewish elements, and that the pre-Christian Dispersion with its varieties is only intelligible on the hypothesis that Phœnician (*i.e.* including Syrian, Arabic, and Canaanite) elements entered into the Jewish race.

So far as the former thesis is concerned, Herr Rosen's monograph offers a fairly convincing view of the data, though the fresh presentation barely establishes his conclusion in its entirety. As for the second thesis, it is possible but not proved—at any rate on the evidence adduced. After reading the monograph, one is more disposed to agree that the 'mission' motive in the Diaspora has to be recognized, though whether it is correct to argue that after the Hellenistic period Judaism was a religion of universalistic tendency rather than a people, is another point. And on the whole, it may be argued, the problem of the Philistines is too intricate to be solved on the lines laid down so lucidly and persuasively by Herr Rosen.

Among the fruitful discussions which are to be encountered in the pages of this stimulating work are those on the range and spirit of proselytism (pp. 64 f.), the Phœnicians at Elephantine (pp. 79 f.), and the evidence for Phœnicians in connexion with the Jewish group at Rome (pp. 95 f.). Professor Bertram, in his most valuable notes, suggests several points of critical interest. One is that

¹ *Juden und Phœnizier*. Das antike Judentum als Missionsreligion und die Entstehung der jüdischen Diaspora. Neu bearbeitet und erweitert von Friedrich Rosen und Georg Bertram (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen; 1929, M.11).

instead of 'Judæa' in Ac 2⁹ the Latin 'Judæi' offers the original reading; this is rejected by Professor Ropes in his recent text, but Professor Bertram maintains that it is the one satisfactory reading, when taken to mean not born Jews but members of the Jewish faith. The notes on Euhemerism (pp. 124, 128) and Is 19¹⁶⁻²⁵ (pp. 131 f.) are excellent, as well as the remarks on the Septuagint (pp. 134, 137, 141, and 143). The brief discussion (p. 149) as to whether Judaism had any 'sacramental' elements should be compared with Dr. D. C. Simpson's observations in *Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge* (pp. 159 f.).

The monograph, therefore, lights up the Hellenistic and Oriental world between the third century B.C. and the third or fourth century A.D., challenging students to revise some of their hypotheses about the spread and spirit of Judaism in that syncretistic period. Even when its definite arguments are set aside, it furnishes the reader with plenty of data for a new insight into the intricate developments of race and religion during these centuries. Indirectly, of course, it bears upon the rise of Christianity also, for if Herr Rosen is correct the propaganda of the Christian faith must have been helped as well as anticipated by the Diaspora as a monotheistic enterprise undertaken for the inner mission of Judaism, i.e. of Judaism interpreted along the lines of the nobler prophets.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

Jesus and History.

PROFESSOR H. PINARD DE LA BOULLAYE, S.J., the author of two large and learned volumes on Comparative Religion—*L'Étude comparée des religions*—has recently published a series of six addresses originally delivered at certain Conferences held in Paris in the spring of last year. The scope of the addresses is indicated by the title of the book, *Jésus et l'histoire* (Éditions Spes, Paris; 12 fr.). On a smaller scale the book attempts the

task undertaken by Bishop Gore in his 'Belief in Jesus Christ.' The first address treats the babel of opposing opinions regarding Jesus Christ, and discusses their origin in current philosophical and historical methods and presuppositions. This study is followed by a competent survey of the opinions of the friends and enemies of Christianity, and of those who were indifferent to its claims, down to the death of Marcus Aurelius; and then by a discussion of the witness of the orthodox Church, its sacrifices, fidelity to tradition, and unanimity. Much the best chapter is the fourth, which examines the witness of Paul. The charges he had to face, we are reminded, did not turn on questions of orthodoxy: 'It is impossible to discover in his writings the least allusion, the least response to such accusations or the trace of such an opposition' (p. 138). The fifth address, on the value of the Gospels, is rather general in character, and suffers in consequence of the official Roman Catholic attitude to source-criticism. It contains, however, the very striking admission that, if the author were forced to choose between the Eucharist and the Gospels, he would choose the latter, since the Host is silent while the Gospels give us Jesus living and speaking. 'After two thousand years His heart still beats in these pages, like that of our parents and our departed friends in their letters to-day yellow with time' (p. 181). The last essay answers the objection that the original Christian tradition has been radically altered in the course of its transmission. This question has been much debated in France, as elsewhere, and the author effectively reverses several popular objections. The authentic tradition, he contends, was not transformed by the love of the first Christians; on the contrary, just because of their love, it was maintained with the greatest strictness (p. 214). Alike popular and scholarly in treatment, the book is a valuable study of present-day problems of faith. The reasoning is close, the illustrations felicitous, and the style frequently rises to heights of real eloquence.

Aberdeen.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

Contributions and Comments.

Manna.

THERE has always been among scientific workers a wide divergence of opinion as to the true nature and origin of the manna, which was for God's people,

during their wilderness experiences, the bread of heaven which He gave them to eat. The most widely accepted suggestion as to its nature has been that it is sap of the *Tamarix*, and it is considered to be either a physiological secretion of the plant, or its

sap flowing from the wounds caused by insects. That suggestion is now abandoned. Manna is a plant. It is one of the Lichens. Its scientific name is *Lecanora esculenta*, or the edible Lichen. It is greyish-yellow in colour and grows on grey limestone rocks, in the form of a wrinkled crust so like the rock itself that it is easily overlooked. Neither of these could be the manna of Exodus, which was a miraculous substance.

In order to solve this problem, the Hebrew University in Jerusalem organized in 1927 a small expedition to the Sinai Peninsula, and the leaders of that expedition, Dr. F. S. Bodenheimer and Dr. O. Theodor, have just published a very interesting account of their investigations, under the title *Ergebnisse der Sinai-Expedition, 1927, der Hebräischen Universität, Jerusalem*. Pp. 143+24 tafeln. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1929.)

The expedition visited some classical localities where manna was recorded. In the course of investigations, it was established beyond doubt that the appearance of manna is a phenomenon well known in other countries under the name of 'honey-dew,' which is a sweet excretion of plant-lice (*Aphidæ*) and scale-insects (*Coccidæ*). Two scale insects mainly responsible for the production of manna were found, namely, *Trabuteria mannipara*, Ehrenb., occurring in the lowlands, and *Najacoccus serpenterius* var. *minor*, Green, which replaces the former in the mountains. Two other Hemipterous insects, *Euscelis decoratus*, Haupt, and *Opsicus jucundus*, Leth., also produce manna, but to a lesser extent. All these insects live on *Tamarix nilotica* var. *mannifera*, Ehrenb.; no manna was observed on other species of *Tamarix*, a fact probably due to some physiological peculiarities of the former. The authors observed the actual excretion by the insects of drops

of clear sweet fluid, and proved by experiments that the fluid is ingested by the insects from the vessels of the phloem. When in an experiment a twig bearing the insects was placed in water, the bark was cut below the insects, the production of manna continued in a normal manner, but it stopped as soon as the flow of carbohydrate solution from the leaves was interrupted by cutting off the bark above the insects. The dry desert climate of Sinai causes the syrup-like fluid excretion to crystallize, and the whitish grains thus produced, which cover the branches or fall to the ground underneath them, constitute the true manna of the Bible.

A chemical analysis of the manna demonstrated the presence of cane sugar, glucose, fructose, and saccharose; pectines were also found, but there was no trace of proteins.

Detailed descriptions of the manna insects are given in the report, which includes very good photographs of various stages of the production of the manna. Notes on the course of the expedition and on the fauna of the Peninsula of Sinai in general provide very interesting reading on that still practically unexplored country.

Accepting the findings of these savants does not affect the miraculous character of the manna of the Israelites. As Dr. M'Laren maintained, 'It was miraculous in its origin—"rained from heaven,"—in its quantity, in its observance of times and seasons, in its putrefaction and preservation, as rotting when kept for greed, and remaining sweet when preserved for the Sabbath. It came straight from the creative will of God, and whether its name means "What is it?" or "It is a gift," the designation is equally true and appropriate, pointing, in the one case, to the mystery of its nature; in the other, to the love of the Giver, and in both referring it directly to the hand of God.'

ARTHUR S. LANGLEY.

Wexnesbury.

Entre Nous.

Adventurous Faith.

Dr. Hugh Black, formerly of Free St. George's, Edinburgh, and now for many years Professor of Practical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, has contributed the last volume to Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton's 'People's Library' (2s. 6d. net). It is necessarily a small book but it is richly suggestive. Dr. Black reminds us that he is not a young man—his memory goes back earlier than

most of the scientific discoveries of our age, to the time when Dr. Bell could not find any one courageous enough to advance him the necessary money to finance his early experiments in the use of the telephone—but his attitude is essentially modern. The title of his book is *The Adventure of being Man*, and the purpose of it is to suggest a way of looking at the mysterious universe and man's mysterious life from the point of view of adventure. He

divides his subject into three—The Adventure, The Adventurer, and The Last Adventure.

What is the adventure? It is a certain attitude of the soul in which it makes a venture on the world and life, throwing itself on an unseen spiritual order. 'We believe that there is an end in purpose with which we can co-operate. We believe that what we experience of beauty and goodness and love are not illusions, and that human life is not the sport of chance. We embark on the great moral and spiritual adventure.

'When we do, we find everywhere the supporting facts. We find this faith the light of everything that lives in man, and that in the strength of it we can build up a human world. We look back into history and see that the spiritual forces have ever said the last word. We see ideas and ideals creating new and vital institutions, and heroic faiths saving the world. We find as a matter of experience that life does not play man false in his noblest hopes, that life hides no treachery against the soul. "This is the true joy in life," says Bernard Shaw in one of his most self-revealing moods, "the being used for a purpose recognized by yourself as a mighty one; the being thoroughly worn out before you are thrown on the scrap-heap; the being a force of nature, instead of a feverish, selfish little clod of ailments and grievances, complaining that the world will not devote itself to making you happy."'

It is forgotten sometimes that the other view of life implies faith also. Dr. Black says: 'The greatest men of faith I meet on this green earth are some who call themselves unbelievers. They have to accept such tremendous miracles, and assert such unproven assumptions'—'the universe is a series of accidents, and flukes, and peradventures, and haphazards, and coincidences. . . . One day there broke off from a flaming sun what ultimately by an amazing series of flukes became this earth. By another astounding series of accidents there gathered somehow on its surface some organic scum.'

And it is forgotten sometimes that the scientist is compelled to make assumptions and to take unproved things for granted before he begins his work. He must assume that the universe is rational; that it is causal not casual. But the fact that knowledge of any kind depends on faith goes deeper even than that. We must believe that the picture of reality that we get from our mental acts is a true one. The world we know is built up as a picture by percepts through the avenues of sense, and by concepts. It is a question here of

credo ut intelligam. We must make a venture of faith.

Again, Dr. Black says everything human stands on this footing. 'The solid world of business, on which we all depend, looks the most material structure erected by man. When we ask our bankers and leaders of industry on what it rests, they reply that it is a system of credit—and credit, like creed, is *credo*, I believe. They will add that business needs public confidence—that is *fides*, faith. The most important development of modern business is the creation and management of what it calls "trusts." The demand which business men are always making on each other as colleagues is for loyalty and fidelity. Trust means confident reliance on integrity, or veracity, or some such quality. Every important business word has in it the word "faith" in Latin or English. So that this immense solid structure of business is so built that if a tenuous thing like credit be impaired, or an equally tenuous thing like public confidence be lost, the whole system would crash.'

The second part of the book deals with the adventurer—what man means. Surely those who cannot make up their minds about God can make them up about man. They cannot decide about another life, they may about this life. But here again it is a venture. Just as in the case of the venture of faith on the world, arguments can be brought on both sides. If it were not so, it would not be a venture. For on one side there are the facts that seem to show nothing in the world but the blind drive of non-moral force, and on the other side are the facts that prove that the world hides no treachery for the man who trusts it. So it is in the choice that we have to make as to what man is. We can point to the facts that link him to everything below him. For there are signs in plenty of his animal ancestry. On the other hand is the long story of the ascent of man. 'We are unworthy of our past heritage and our present privilege if we forget the great society of the noble living and the noble dead. This also is a fact, that every high thought and every splendid passion exemplified in others find instant response in our heart. We can say that this is man at his best, this is the true man, this is what he may be and should be, what he in nature is.'

There is a drastic sanity in true realism. But in the realm of art to-day a facsimile of morbid and unsavoury things often passes for it. Lately, Dr. Black says, a realist of that type wrote in commendation of the book of another, 'If there is a writer in America to-day who can lay hold of mean

people and mean lives and tear their mean hearts out with more appalling realism, his work is unknown to me.' And, he adds, this was supposed to be such high praise that the publisher used it to advertise his wares. Conrad, who was certainly not a romanticist in dealing with life, says: 'What one feels so hopelessly barren in declared pessimism is just its arrogance. It seems as if the discovery made by many men at various times that there is so much evil in the world were a source of proud and unholy joy to some of the modern writers. . . . To be hopeful in an artistic sense it is not necessary to think that the world is good. It is enough to believe that there is no impossibility of its being made so.'

The one leader who deliberately staked everything on His faith in man was the Lord Jesus. And He fearlessly put His theory into practice. The heart of the objection to Him was that He acted His theory out and in that endangered the prestige of the whole social and religious system—'this man receiveth sinners and eateth with them.'

The third part of the book deals with the last adventure—'If a man die, shall he live again?'—and in it Dr. Black suggests the method of approach as part of the whole adventure of being man. But the reader must turn to the book itself for the development of this. All the ventures hang together.

The Noble Risk.

'Religion is not a formula of escape nor a way of safety. It is an adventure of the spirit. Clement of Alexandria, of the second century, who was of a cultivated pagan family, described his step from paganism into the Christian Church as taking "the noble risk of a desertion unto God." It needs only a little imagination to understand some of the pathos and heroism in the experience so modestly expressed. To break away from the safety and security of old ways, snapping tender ties of kinship and friendship, was "desertion" that meant pain and loss. Only the courage of a great faith, venturing from the known and the usual, could have induced him to take the noble risk.'¹

Religious Thought of India.

The Student Christian Movement Press has just published a volume of selections from the religious literature of India with the title *Temple Bells*, edited by Mr. A. J. Appasamy, M.A., D.Phil. (5s. net). We are interested more than ever to-day in the mind of India. And the reading of this book certainly affords one avenue of approach. The

publishers and the editor together have done all that they could to make it an attractive one to us. There are excellent introductory sketches of the authors of the poems, and delightful sepia illustrations from Indian pictures and sculpture. We give two selections. The first is by Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahansa. Born of Brahman parents, he strove to conquer his pride of ancestry by doing the work of the street cleaner and scavenger. Anxious to know and understand other religions, he became later the disciple of a Muhammadan saint. His followers have quickened the religious impulses of the people of India, and they have done much social work.

The second quotation is from Rabindranath Tagore's volume of Bengali Poems—'Fruit Gathering.'

MOMENTS OF DEEP SILENCE.

Behold the bee buzzing and circling round and round near the blown lotus, how it buzzeth and circleth again and again:

But anon it goeth inside the flower, and then it setteth down and drinketh of the honey in silence:

Even so, disciple, man talketh and argueth before he hath found his joy in the Lord, before he hath tasted of faith:

But when he findeth the nectar at last in the opened lotus of his heart, at once he setteth down to drink it, and babbleth and talketh no more.²

THE BARE INFINITY OF GOD'S UNCROWDED PRESENCE.

Time after time I came to Your gate with raised hands, asking for more and yet more.

You gave and gave, now in slow measure, now in sudden excess.

I took some, and some things I let drop: some lay heavy on my hands: some I made into playthings and broke them when tired; till the wrecks and the hoard of Your gifts grew immense, hiding You, and the ceaseless expectation wore my heart out.

Take, oh take—has now become my cry.

Shatter all from this beggar's bowl: put out this lamp of the importunate watcher: hold my hands, raise me from the still-gathering heap of Your gifts into the bare infinity of Your uncrowded presence.³

² P. 69.

³ P. 103.

¹ H. Black, *The Adventure of being Man*, 59.